

Duke University Libraries



D02289616Y

DUKE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
DURHAM, N. C.



Rec'd 1932
Library Budget
Fund



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

2. L

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

EDITORS: G. B. STRICKLER, D. D.; E. H. BARNETT, D. D.

MANAGER: GEORGE SUMMEY, CHESTER, S. C.

VOL. II.

APRIL, 1888.

No. 1.

- I. THE LOLLARDS. J. F. Latimer, Ph. D. (Lips.), D. D.
- II. THE MAJESTY OF LAW. B. M. Palmer, D. D., LL. D.
- III. THE WORD OF GOD vs. "THE BIBLE OF MODERN SCIENTIFIC THEOLOGY."
George D. Armstrong, D. D., LL. D.
- IV. THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH. J. A. Quarles, D. D.
- V. THE PRESBYTERIAN ORIGIN OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE. A. W. Miller, D. D., LL. D.
- VI. THE PERILS OF EXCESSIVE INDIVIDUALISM. Samuel M. Smith.
- VII. NOTES:
Christian Giving, or Ecclesiastical Merchandising? E. C. Murray.
Evangelism: Its Place, and how it should be Promoted. B. Helm.
James Hannington. James Henderson Smith.
- VIII. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS: By J. L. Girardeau, Thos. E. Peck, B. B. Warfield, W. W. Moore, S. M. Smith, Robt. A. Webb, and Geo. D. Armstrong.
- IX. NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

CHESTER, S. C.:

MANAGER "PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY."

NEW YORK: ANSON D. F. RANDOLPH & Co.

\$3.00 PER YEAR.

80 CENTS PER SINGLE NUMBER.

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY

IS UNDER THE SUPERVISION AND CONTROL OF AN ASSOCIATION

COMPOSED OF THE FOLLOWING MINISTERS:

GEO. D. ARMSTRONG, D. D., LL. D.; E. H. BARNETT, D. D.; JOHN F. CANNON;
WM. C. CLARK; J. N. CRAIG, D. D.; A. B. CURRY; ROBT. L. DABNEY, D. D.
LL. D.; JNO. L. GIRARDEAU, D. D., LL. D.; C. R. HEMPHILL, D. D.; C. C. HERS-
MAN, D. D.; T. W. HOOPER, D. D.; C. W. HUMPHREYS; ISAAC J. LONG, D. D.;
A. W. MILLER, D. D.; W. W. MOORE, D. D.; B. M. PALMER, D. D., LL. D.; THOS.
E. PECK, D. D., LL. D.; J. B. SHEARER, D. D.; SAMUEL M. SMITH; R. K. SMOOT,
D. D., LL. D.; G. B. STRICKLER, D. D.; ROBERT A. WEBB; T. D. WITHERSPOON,
D. D., LL. D.

THE QUARTERLY will endeavor to represent the views and literature of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, and to promote the interests of the Church in all her relations and departments of work.

An opportunity will be given in its pages for the fair and impartial discussion, within limits, of the great questions of the day.

Each number will contain one or two distinctively theological or philosophical articles, with others of a more popular character. In a separate department of Notes, the effort will be made to give brief discussions of matters of present moment, and in such form as to be of special value to the thinking people of the Church outside the ranks of the ministry.

Special attention will be given to current literature; and critical notices, full rather than numerous, of the most valuable new books will be prepared by men specially trained in the several departments of learning or work to which they belong.

A large number of articles on timely and important subjects has been engaged, and the patrons of the QUARTERLY may confidently expect it to be kept up to a high standard of ability and timeliness.

Each writer is responsible for the views expressed in his article, and ordinarily the author's name will be appended.

Address all communications, mss., etc., to the Manager, Chester, S. C.

Copyright, 1887.
George Summey, Manager.

Entered as second-class matter
at the Post-office, Chester, S. C.

Whittet & Shepperson, Richmond, Va., Printers.

THE
PRESBYTERIAN
QUARTERLY.

EDITORS: G. B. STRICKLER, D. D., AND E. H. BARNETT, D. D.

MANAGER: GEORGE SUMMEY.

VOL. II.

1888.

APRIL—JULY—OCTOBER.

Chester, S. C.:

MANAGER PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

New York:

ANSON D. F. RANDOLPH & CO.

COPYRIGHT, 1888,
By GEORGE SUMMEY, MANAGER.

CONTENTS.

VOLUME II.

	PAGES.
Alexander's (Lindsay) Theology..... <i>John L. Girardeau</i>	484-487
American Independence, Its Presbyterian Origin... <i>A. W. Miller</i>	76-106
Anti-biblical Theories of Rights..... <i>Robt. L. Dabney</i>	220-243
Anti-theistic Scientists, A Short Method with... <i>Robert Watts</i>	389-394
Bible Study in College, Methods of..... <i>J. B. Shearer</i>	282-286
Centennial Celebration in Philadelphia <i>A. B. Curry</i>	309-315
Christian Giving or Ecclesiastical Merchandizing ... <i>E. C. Murray</i>	123-130
Church Unity <i>J. A. Quarles</i>	59-76
Contra-natural Character of the Miracle <i>John L. Girardeau</i>	177-210
Cooke's Credentials of Science the Warrant of Faith... <i>R. A. Webb</i>	494-496
Criticisms and Reviews, ...	145-168, 316-335, 481-505
Dabney's Refutation of the Sensualistic Philosophy, etc.... <i>James McCosh</i>	275-282
Dawson's Egypt and Syria..... <i>Geo. D. Armstrong</i>	332-334
Dewey's Psychology <i>R. A. Webb</i>	329-332
Dorner's Christian Ethics..... <i>Thomas E. Peck</i>	148-150
Drummond's Apology to Scientists <i>D. E. Frierson</i>	472-480
Evangelism, Again <i>J. F. Cannon</i>	462-465
Evangelism, Its Place and Promotion..... <i>Benj. Helm</i>	130-144
Ewald's Theology <i>John L. Girardeau</i>	481-484
Exclusion of the Bible from Public Schools ... <i>Thos. E. Barksdale</i>	313-316
Excessive Individualism <i>Samuel M. Smith</i>	106-122
Foster's Seminary Method of Original Study... <i>J. F. Latimer</i>	491-492
Hannington, James..... <i>James H. Smith</i>	136-144
Hebrew Poetry, The Characteristics of..... <i>John H. Thomas</i>	261-275
Hodge's (Dr.) Theology of the Shorter Catechism... <i>B. B. Warfield</i>	321
Impeccability of Christ <i>C. W. Humphreys</i>	395-411
Individualism, The Perils of Excessive, ... <i>Samuel M. Smith</i>	106-122
Inspiration Conference Papers <i>Samuel M. Smith</i>	319-321

	PAGES.
Keil's Biblical Archæology.....	<i>W. W. Moore</i> 158-160
Kerr's People's History of Presbyterianism	<i>J. W. Rosebro</i> 492-494
Ladd's Elements of Physiological Psychology.	<i>Samuel M. Smith</i> 156-158
Ladd's What is the Bible?.....	<i>Samuel M. Smith</i> 489-491
Law, The Majesty of the	<i>B. M. Palmer</i> 28-39
Le Compté's Evolution and Religious Thought.	<i>Geo. D. Armstrong</i> 498-501
Lollards, The	<i>J. F. Latimer</i> 1-27
MacDonald's (George) Religious Romances ...	<i>Jas. H. Smith</i> 445-461
Manly's Bible Doctrine of Inspiration.....	<i>H. C. Alexander</i> 316-319
McCosh's Religious Aspect of Evolution.....	<i>Geo. D. Armstrong</i> 501-505
Miracle, The, Its Contra-natural Character ...	<i>John L. Girardeau</i> 177-210
Miracle, The, Its Relation to Revelation	<i>John L. Girardeau</i> 370-388
New Theology in the Antipodes, The	<i>B. B. Warfield</i> 487-488
Non-secular Character of the Church, The	<i>C. R. Vaughan</i> 412-444
Northern General Assembly	<i>Thos. A. Hoyt</i> 306-309
Notes	 123-144, 275-315, 462-480
Pentateuchal Story of Creation, The.....	<i>Geo. D. Armstrong</i> 345-369
Perils of Excessive Individualism	<i>Samuel M. Smith</i> 106-122
Presbyterian Origin of American Independence...	<i>A. W. Miller</i> 76-106
Pressensé's Ancient World and Christianity...	<i>J. F. Latimer</i> 321-324
Pressensé's Study of Origins	<i>Geo. D. Armstrong</i> 164-166
Pünjer's History of the Christian Philosophy of Religion...	<i>J. F. Latimer</i> 326-329
Recent Publications	 168-176, 336-344, 505-512
Religious Romances of George MacDonald	<i>Jas. H. Smith</i> 445-461
Reviews	 145-168, 316-325, 481-505
Ritchian Doctrine of Redemption, The.....	<i>B. B. Warfield</i> 150-155
Rred's Evolution <i>vs.</i> Involution	<i>Geo. D. Armstrong</i> 166-168
Schaff's Church and State	<i>Geo. A. Blackburn</i> 324-326
Scottish-Virginia Presbyterianism	<i>William T. Price</i> 465-472
Shearer's Syllabus	<i>Robt. A. Webb</i> 155-156
Southern General Assembly	<i>L. G. Barbour</i> 286-306
Spirit of Presbyterianism in Modern History, The...	<i>Jas. A. Waddell</i> 243-260
Stuckenberg's Introduction to the Study of Philosophy...	<i>Robt. A. Webb</i> ... 496-498
Unchangeable Word, The	<i>T. W. Hooper</i> 210-221
Unity of the Church, The	<i>J. A. Quarles</i> 59-76
Warren's Paradise Found.....	<i>W. W. Moore</i> .. 160-164
Was Christ Liable to Sin?	<i>C. W. Humphreys</i> 395-411
Watt's Reign of Causality	<i>John L. Girardeau</i> 145-148
Word of God <i>vs.</i> The Bible of Modern Scientific Theology.	<i>G. D. Armstrong</i> 39-59

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 4. — APRIL, 1888.

I. THE LOLLARDS.

IN the Middle Ages there were developed two opposite views of the sphere and mission of the church. One was that of Hildebrand and his school, who began with the claim that the church should be independent of the secular power, and ended with the demand that all civil rulers should recognize the successor of St. Peter as their suzerain. The natural outcome of this theory was that the administration of civil governments should be largely in the hands of ecclesiastics, that the hierarchy should be enriched at the expense of the state, and that the whole body of the clergy should be practically divorced from their spiritual functions.

The other view found advocates in William of Ockham and Marsilius of Padua, who held that the sphere of the church was purely spiritual. Not only was the state independent of the church, but the pope, with all ecclesiastics, was of right, in all secular concerns, subject to the civil ruler.

Of this latter view John Wyclif became the champion in England. It was as a member of the Parliament of 1366, which repudiated the papal claim for tribute that King John had engaged to pay, that we first hear of Wyclif's opposition to the pretensions of Rome. From that time forth he was busy refuting her claims, and, by the use of all the means in his power, helping on the efforts, then making under the lead of John of Gaunt, to exclude the dignitaries of the church from secular offices and confine them to their legitimate work.

Wyclif soon became convinced that the great obstacle which lay in the way of the reform to which he had devoted himself was the wealth of the hierarchy. While bishops and abbots controlled enormous estates they must, of necessity, be secular lords; and, as the greatest among the landed proprietors of the realm, it was inevitable that they should be largely influential in the administration of its government. In his study of the Scriptures he found nothing to justify the possession of wealth by the clergy, but everything to condemn it. Christ and His apostles were poor men, and their successors, like them, should devote themselves to preaching the gospel, while they depended upon the offerings of the people for their support.

Gradually Wyclif reached the conviction that the papal system was essentially at variance with the Scriptures. He came to recognize in it a great despotism which, while it wielded spiritual weapons, was of the earth earthly, and which could not be divested of its wealth and continue to exist. The way was now prepared for his complete repudiation of the papacy. Only the fitting occasion was needed, and it came when, in 1378, the Great Schism occurred and the christian world was called upon to contemplate the unedifying spectacle of two rival successors of St. Peter—one at Rome and the other at Avignon—hurling their curses at each other. He now boldly declared that the papacy was contrary to the Bible, and that the two popes were “the two halves of Anti-christ.”

This rejection of the papacy must not be confounded with the repudiation of the church. There is no evidence that Wyclif now, or ever during his life, contemplated separation from the Catholic communion. A national church, independent of Roman or Avignonesse Pontiff, was no new idea in the world. It is probable that our reformer hoped that the church in England might be separated from the papacy, and that the clergy might be reclaimed and brought to do their legitimate work. At this juncture, it seems to have occurred to him that it might be possible to raise up a body of simple priests, who should have no fixed abiding place, and therefore no fat livings, but should go forth in apostolic poverty to preach the pure word of God wherever men would hear, and thus set an example the contagion of which would finally ef-

fect the reformation of the clergy and the redemption of the church in England. The conception resembles that of Francis of Assisi, but is an improvement on it. Wyclif's band of preachers constituted "a new order, anticipating, in its combination of the regular with the secular element, something of the views of Ignatius Loyola, but in its practical aspect bearing a near resemblance to the lay preachers of John Wesley, such as they were while his strong hand was yet upon them. To be poor without mendicancy, to combine the flexible unity, the swift obedience of an order, with free and constant mingling among the poor; such was the ideal of Wyclif's 'simple priests.'" ¹ That there was no intention to leave the church, but rather to exert an influence within it, is proved by the fact that these preachers "were employed, under episcopal sanction, through what was then the immense diocese of Lincoln, and probably in others also." ²

The office to which these men were appointed was to bring the truth as contained in the Scriptures to the people. The business of the "priest" was, according to Wyclif's view, primarily that of a preacher. Every man has a right to know just what the word of God contains, and the priest must make it known to him. It was but a step from this idea, that all have right to know the truth as it is contained in the Bible, to the conviction that they should not be dependent upon any man as the intermediary of that knowledge. Every believer is a priest and no man should come between him and God. He should have the Scriptures in his own tongue and be permitted to read and judge for himself. We do not know just when Wyclif's version of the New Testament was completed, but we know that he was at work upon it when he instituted his system of itineracy, so that from the beginning, doubtless, these preachers carried with them to their work portions of the Bible in the vernacular. Upon that day when these godly men went forth, with the English Scriptures in their hands, proclaiming that every man has the right to learn the will of God for himself from an open Bible, in a tongue which he can understand, the English Reformation began.

When the wandering preachers first entered upon their mission,

¹ Shirley's introduction to *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. xl. ² *Ibid.*

Wyclif had not advanced, in his criticism of the existing ecclesiastical system, beyond matters concerning the external organization and policy of the church. He condemned the papacy, the wealth, the corruption and secularization of the clergy, and the withholding of the word of God from the people. In the beginning, these furnished the matter of the protest of the "simple priests." It was not long, however, before Wyclif's deeper study of the Bible led him into the field of doctrinal reform. In the summer of 1381, he made a bold attack on the central dogma of Rome—the doctrine of transubstantiation. His twelve Conclusions,¹ and the Confession² published a short time afterwards, distinctly declare that after the consecration by the priest the substance of the bread and wine remain as before. The result was his ejection from his chair at Oxford and his retirement to Lutterworth. Applying now fully the principle that the Scriptures are the sole and sufficient guide in all matters of religion, he rejected the worship of saints and images, pilgrimages to shrines, penance, indulgence, absolution—in fact, almost the entire *cultus* of the church. Wyclif's itinerants, reflecting always the master's teachings, now went everywhere denouncing these idolatrous practices and inventions of men.

We have seen that the "poor priests" began their work inside the church, and under episcopal authority. Wyclif was permitted for some reason not well understood, to continue his work as pastor and preacher at Lutterworth unmolested till his death on the last day of 1384. But the wandering preachers soon made themselves obnoxious to the ecclesiastical authorities, and an effort was made to silence them. Archbishop Courtenay, in 1382, issued a mandate for their suppression in the diocese of London,³ and there is reason to believe that repressive measures were inaugurated in other dioceses as well, so that from this time they were not permitted to bear their witness under the authority of the church. But they were not silenced, nor was the growth of their party seriously impeded, if we may credit Henry Knighton, a cotemporary chronicler, who tells us that, in this very year of 1382, they "were

¹ For text see Shirley's *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, pp. 105, 106.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 115-132.

³ Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, Vol. III., p. 22, (Cattley's Edition).

very much increased, and starting like saplings from the root of a tree, they were multiplied and filled every place within the compass of the land.”¹ To this time we must refer the first application to them of the term *Lollard*, by which it was intended to stigmatize them at once as both fanatics and heretics.²

It was not due to any lack of disposition on the part of Courtenay and his clergy to destroy the Lollards that they were left without molestation until the close of the century. A number of causes combined to secure this end, chief among which may be reckoned the fact that they had gained the sympathy of many of the landed gentry and also of certain members of the highest nobility who were near the king's person. Says Stubbs,³ “In the meanwhile [*i. e.*, in the years 1388 and 1389,] the doctrinal views of the party spread; they counted among their friends some influential knights and some courtiers in whose eyes the political power of the bishops was their greatest sin.” Twice during his reign King Richard II. was upon the point of being drawn into the archbishop's scheme for persecution. In the year 1382, he had, under Courtenay's influence, gone so far as to admit among the statutes of the kingdom an ordinance commanding the sheriffs and other civil officers to lend their assistance to the bishops for the apprehension and imprisonment of the itinerant preachers, together with their adherents.⁴ But though it was pretended that this was done by the consent of Parliament, it was with the concurrence of the House of Lords alone. The Commons, upon their assembling, in October, 1382, insisted that the so-called statute should be annulled, as not having received their approval and, on that account, not being a

¹ See also Stubbs' *Constitutional History of England*, II., 488, and Green's *Short History*, Ch. V., Sec. III.

² The use of the word as a term of reproach is much older. It was applied as early as 1309 to the Brethren of the Free Spirit in Holland and Brabant, and was employed interchangeably with *Beghard*. It was used in Germany also of the *Fratricelli*. The most probable derivation is from *lullen*, to hum, to lull with a song, (*cf.* lullaby). It was used of the Beghards on account of the chanting to which they were addicted. Originally it suggested fanaticism, and then came to be employed as the equivalent of *heretic*. Any person condemned by the church might be called a Lollard; hence its application to the Wyclifites.

³ *Const. Hist.* II., 488; *cf.* Milman, *Latin Christianity*, Book XIII., Ch. VII.

⁴ Lechler, *Johann von Wiclif und die Vorgeschichte der Reformation*, I., 676.

legislative act. Although the archbishop and his suffragans had in the meantime been empowered to imprison the wandering preachers and those who defended the condemned views of Wyclif, and to detain them in their own prisons until they repented or recanted, only a few of the more prominent of these teachers were disturbed.

In the year 1395, certain leading men among the Lollards presented a petition to Parliament, setting forth, in twelve conclusions,¹ the abuses of the church and begging that they be reformed. The twelve conclusions constitute an earnest protest against church endowments, the established form of ordination to the priesthood, celibacy of the clergy, transubstantiation, the use of exorcisms and benedictions of salt, bread, clothes, and the like, the secular employments of priests, prayers for the dead, pilgrimages to shrines together with prayers and offerings to crosses and images, auricular confession, and of vows of chastity taken by women. To these they added denunciations of war and capital punishment, and also of the arts of the goldsmith and sword cutler. This petition, supported as it was by influential members of Parliament, alarmed the clergy, and a desperate effort was made to persuade King Richard, who was absent at the time in Ireland, that the principles of the Lollards therein revealed were not only dangerous to the church, but threatened also the life of the state. The king was moved by the appeal and returned at once to England. The knights who had favored the petition were severely reprimanded, and Richard seemed disposed to heed the exhortation of the pope, which was now added to the solicitation of the archbishop, to lend his assistance to the church in bringing the offending party to punishment and purging England of their doctrines. But the disorders of the kingdom and the difficulties which his tyrannical policy raised up to confront him left Richard no opportunity, and the Lollards escaped for five years longer.

The accession of Henry IV., who in 1399 deposed and succeeded Richard, brought the long averted calamity. Henry, a son of John of Gaunt the protector of Wyclif, had once sympathized,

¹ See text, in the original Latin, in Shirley's edition of *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, pp. 360-369.

as did his father, with the Lollards. But now he needed the support of the clergy to his precarious title to the throne. The agreement between him and Archbishop Arundel, the successor of Courtenay, bound him to coöperate in the extermination of the Lollards. Down to this time no severer punishment had been proposed for heresy than prolonged imprisonment, with a view to recantation, penance, and restoration to the church. But on the 21st of January, 1401, with Henry's sanction, the infamous act, *de hæretico comburendo*, was placed upon the statute book of England,¹ and the work of exterminating the disciples of Wyclif began. At the head of the long line of martyrs stands William Sautré, who, within a few weeks, perished in the flames. But though victim followed victim, the Lollards were not intimidated. They still waged war upon the abuses against which they began their protest. In 1410, they felt strong enough to inaugurate aggressive measures. They presented to the Parliament of this year another petition, praying that "the lands of the bishops and religious corporations should be confiscated, not for a year only, as had been suggested before, but for the permanent endowment of fifteen earls, fifteen hundred knights, six thousand esquires, and a hundred hospitals, £20,000 being still left for the king."²

Such boldness as this may have been due to the fact that the king, although still outwardly in league with the persecutors of the Lollards, was known to have no zeal in the cause. At the beginning of his reign, it had happened that Salisbury, who was popularly recognized as the head of the Lollard party, had refused to acknowledge Henry, and had perished in one of the revolts against him. This fact had been used to justify the allegation that the entire party was disloyal to the House of Lancaster. A petition

¹ Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, III., 31, 32. See the statute in Burnet's *History of the Reformation*, I., 19. As to the date, some give it as 1400. The confusion arises from the fact that, in the middle ages, many still regarded the year as beginning with March, so that January 21, 1401, would be, according to their mode of reckoning, January 21, 1400. Modern writers frequently introduce confusion by failure to correct, according to present usage, the dates they find in their sources. The writer of the article on the Lollards in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, and Lechler, one of the great authorities on Wyclif and the Lollards, have failed to make this correction in the date under consideration.

² Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, III., 64.

was laid before Henry in the Parliament of 1406, alleging, among other things, that the Lollards were spreading reports that King Richard was alive, and were promulgating the pretended prophecies that he would be restored to the throne.¹ All this activity, so evidently directed to the end of convincing the king that the party was a standing menace to his throne, is suggestive. The king was not zealous enough, and needed to be brought under the influence of motives of a more personal character. It is more suggestive still that, though Henry agreed to the petition, and approved of the statute based upon it, nothing more is heard of it. When this is coupled with the fact that the man who, since the death of Salisbury, was the acknowledged head of the Lollard party, was the intimate friend of the king and continued to receive many tokens of his favor, we are justified in believing that Henry was, at heart, no enemy to the Lollards; and, if this be true, it carries with it the refutation of the charge that the Lollards were threatening the whole fabric of society, and were menacing the throne itself.

That man who kept his place in the favor and affections of the king, notwithstanding the fact that he was chief of the Lollards, was Sir John Oldcastle, who in the right of his wife became Lord Cobham. In early life he had identified himself with the disciples of Wyclif, and there is every reason to believe that, unlike many of the nobility whose sympathy with the Lollards did not extend beyond their efforts to disestablish the church, he had been brought under the power of the truth proclaimed by the "poor priests" and was a sincere and devoted christian man. His castle was always open for the entertainment and protection of the wandering preachers, and he freely used his means to forward the cause. He employed scribes to copy portions of Wyclif's translation of the Scriptures and his tracts, for distribution among the people. He also supported a great number of itinerants, especially in the dioceses of London, Rochester, and Hereford.²

So zealous a Lollard could not have failed to draw upon him the hatred of the primate, and when the fact was recognized that Oldcastle stood as a barrier in the way of the full accomplishment of his designs upon the heretics, Arundel's resentment ripened into

¹ Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, III., 359.

² Foxe, *Acts and Mon.*, III., 322.

the determination to seize the first opportunity that offered itself to destroy him. No such opportunity came, however, during the reign of Henry IV. Oldecastle continued in high favor to the end, being entrusted as late as 1411 (for he was also the first soldier of the kingdom) with the command of the forces sent to the assistance of the Duke of Burgundy. When, in 1413, Henry V. succeeded to the throne, he seems to have thought to atone for his previous gay and dissolute life by becoming the devout patron of the church. Arundel determined to seize upon this new-born zeal to secure the destruction of Oldecastle. The convocation of that year pronounced him "a most pernicious heretic," who should be punished without delay. Accordingly, the archbishop, at the head of a large deputation of ecclesiastical dignitaries, appeared at Kennington, where the king was then sojourning, laid before him charges against Cobham, and begged to be permitted to summon him for trial.¹ "Henry honored the valiant knight, the skillful general, who had already distinguished himself in the wars of France, who might hereafter (for Henry's ambitious schemes were assuredly within his heart) be of signal service in the same fields. He had no doubt that his own arguments would convince so noble a subject, so brave a soldier, so aspiring a knight."² He bade the primate wait, therefore, until he should, by personal appeal, make the effort to induce Oldecastle to confess his errors in religion and submit to the church. Henry little knew the firmness of conviction and the depth of religious feeling which possessed the soul of his subject. The response to the king's arguments and appeal are just what might have been expected from such a man: "You, most worthy prince, I am always prompt and willing to obey, forasmuch as I know you a christian king and the appointed minister of God, bearing the sword to the punishment of evil-doers and for safeguard of them that be virtuous. Unto you, next my eternal God, owe I my whole obedience, and submit thereunto, as I have done ever, all that I have, either of fortune or nature, ready at all times to fulfill whatsoever ye shall in the Lord command me. But, as touching the pope and his

¹ *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, pp. 434, 435.

² Milman, *Latin Christianity*, Vol. VII., p. 418.

spirituality, I owe them neither suit nor service, forasmuch as I know him, by the Scriptures, to be the great Antichrist, the son of perdition, the open adversary of God, and the abomination standing in the holy place.”¹

The king was greatly displeased with Oldecastle's resistance, and, in his resentment, suffered the archbishop to proceed. The knight was summoned before Arundel, to answer upon the charge of heresy, but refused to obey the citation. When, however, the summoner appeared accompanied by the king's officer, Oldecastle, as a loyal subject, submitted. We cannot dwell upon the details of his examinations before the primate.² His bearing was worthy of his station and his faith. No threats could intimidate him; no sophistry could blind him to the real issues. Like the true christian knight that he was, he bore himself with dignity and heroic courage. Of no avail, however, was his defense. He had been abandoned by the king, and the decision of Arundel and his associates had been reached long before the trial began. As an obstinate, unrepentant heretic, he was condemned to death under the statute *de haeretico comburendo*. Remanded to prison to await the day of execution, he made his escape, and seems very soon to have left the vicinity of London and hidden himself in Wales.

The supreme opportunity had now arrived for the enemies of the Lollards. It was well employed to fix upon them finally the guilt of disloyalty and treason. Reports were diligently circulated of the gathering of a large force of Lollards, which, under the command of Oldecastle, should seize the king, make their leader Protector of the realm, destroy the hierarchy, confiscate the ecclesiastical endowments—in a word, revolutionize the state and make an end of the church. Such rumors, diligently bruited abroad, had their desired effect upon the mind of the king, and he was aroused to active coöperation with the archbishop.

The only *fact* which can be established, among the many allegations with which some historians have not scrupled to burden their pages, when dealing with this subject, is that, one night early

¹ Foxe, *Acts and Mon.*, III., 322.

² See Foxe, *Acts and Mon.*, III., 326, *seq.*; also, *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, pp. 433-449.

in January, 1414, and a short time after the escape of Oldcastle, a meeting of Lollards took place at St. Giles's Field, near London. The report was that they were to be joined by 50,000 men from the city. The king, being informed beforehand, set guards at the gates of London, and with an armed force dispersed those who were gathered in St. Giles's Field, and frightened off those who were on their way to the place of rendezvous. Some thirty or forty were captured, and were soon after put to death. The assertion of Mr. Hume,¹ that "upon the trial of the prisoners, the treasonable designs of the sect were rendered certain, both from evidence and from the confession of the criminals themselves," is not borne out by the authorities he cites, not one of whom makes any such statements.² It seems that some of those who were caught on their way to the meeting, when asked whither they were going, said they were going to meet Lord Cobham. It is probable that, having heard of his escape from prison, they supposed he would be present at the meeting; but there is not a shadow of proof that the assembly was for any other purpose than to hear a favorite preacher. Their coming together secretly, and in a secluded place, creates no presumption of treasonable designs. The Lollards were now forbidden to hold public meetings for divine worship, and were compelled to hold their religious services clandestinely. As to Oldcastle, no one has adduced any evidence whatever that he was present, or even in that portion of the island.

When Parliament met in May, 1414, the excitement had not abated. "The chancellor, in his opening speech, declared that one of the causes of the summons was to provide for the defense of the nation against the Lollards,"³ and a step in advance of the statute of 1401 was now taken. Heresy was made an offense against the common law. "The secular power, no longer content to aid in the execution of the ecclesiastical sentences, undertook, where it was needed, the initiative against the Lollards."⁴ The new statute required all civil officers of the realm to "make oath,

¹ *History of England*, ch. 19, Vol. II., p. 415.

² See Lord Brougham's *History of England and France under the House of Lancaster*. Note XXVIII., pp. 375-377.

³ Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, III., 81.

⁴ *Ibid.*

in taking of their charge and offices, to extend their whole pain and diligence to put out, cease, and destroy, all manner of heresies and errors, commonly called lollardies, within the places in which they exercise their charges and offices from time to time, with all their power."¹ Henceforth conviction of heresy was at the same time conviction of treason, and carried with it forfeiture of blood and estate. Under this law, not only Oldcastle, but every Lollard in the realm was a traitor, no matter how loyal in fact he might be to the king.

Sir John had already been declared an outlaw, and a price, equal in our present money to \$40,000, set upon his head. It is just possible that he, driven thus to desperation and as the only means of self-defense, was ready to excite rebellion or join in with the enemies of the king in Scotland and elsewhere. This, we say, is just possible and may be the fact, but there is no conclusive evidence to that effect. In fact, so very little weight is there in the evidence which those who are interested in blackening Oldcastle's character can adduce, that the more careful historians decline to commit themselves with confidence to the affirmation that he was guilty.² Others deny that there is any truth whatever in these charges.³ For more than three years, he was able to hide himself in Wales; but, towards the close of the year 1417, he was captured and brought to London. The lords, upon the petition of the commons, sentenced him to execution, and he was hung in chains as a traitor and slowly roasted to death as a heretic.

¹ See statute entire in Foxe's *Acts and Mon.*, III., 353-355.

² Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, III., 80, says: "He failed in an attempt to excite a rebellion in 1415, in connection, *it is said*, with the Southampton plot." In a footnote, on the same page, he adds: "Oldcastle either was, *or was said to be*, in league with the Scots and with the Mortimer party in Wales, and to have relations with the pseudo-Richard even at the last." Robertson, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. VII., pp. 300, 301 (*American Edition*), says: "He afterwards reappeared, and, *as he was supposed to be concerned in revolutionary designs*, was arrested, and was brought to the bar of the House of Lords." Cf. Milman's *Latin Christianity*, VII., pp. 423-425. On page 424, he says: "*He was said to have declared himself a faithful subject of his liege lord, Richard II., thus avouching, as though in secret intelligence with the Scots, the wild tale, unquestionably current, that Richard was still alive in that kingdom.*"

³ Foxe, *Acts and Mon.*, III., 348-405; Brougham, *History of England and France under the House of Lancaster*, 81, 82.

With the death of Oldecastle, the Lollards lost whatever political significance they had ever had. They were still persecuted, but the violence of it gradually abated, until, in 1431, it ceased entirely, and the followers of Wyclif dropped from the records of the times.

If we seek an explanation of this fact, we are informed by some of the historians that the Lollard party itself became, at this time, practically extinct. For example, Froude, after relating the events connected with Oldecastle's death, and the story of the measures employed in the next following years against the Lollards, adds: "Thus perished Wycliffe's labor,—not wholly, because his translation of the Bible still remained a rare treasure: a seed of future life, which would spring again under happier circumstances. But the sect which he organized, the special doctrines which he set himself to teach, after a brief blaze of success, sank into darkness; and no trace remained of Lollardy except the black memory of contempt and hatred with which the heretics of the fourteenth century were remembered by the English people, long after the actual reformation had become the law of the land."¹

If we desire to know how it is to be accounted for that so promising a movement should have come to so untimely an end, it is intimated that the party gathered by Wyclif's wandering priests soon ceased to be interested chiefly in matters of religion, and became a political party; that it frittered away its force in various directions, to the neglect of the high ends which had inspired the immediate disciples of Wyclif,² and that, when its political leader was gone, it was only a matter of time for this now aimless party to go to pieces and disappear.

Had the writers who have promulgated these opinions taken the trouble to gather all the facts and give them their proper interpretation, they would have discovered, *1st*, That the Lollards, as a party, were never more than incidentally connected with the political agitations of the times; and *2nd*, That the movement to which Wyclif gave impulse never came to an end; but that his followers continued to exist in great numbers throughout the fif-

¹ *History of England*, II., 35.

² Creighton, *The Papacy during the Reformation*, I., 306.

teenth century, and constituted one of the chief factors in the religious revolution of the next century, which gave England to Protestantism. Let us consider these in their order:

1. Mention has been made already of Wyclif's views concerning the connexion between the wealth of the church and the secularization and corruption of the clergy. In his opposition to the opulence and political power of the hierarchy, he had the sympathy of a great number of the nobility and landed gentry of England. As it had been with the master, so it was with the disciples. Gradually there was attracted to the Lollard party a considerable body of knights who were chiefly interested in its protest against the endowments of the church. As time went on, they took the lead in the agitation of this matter. It was they who inspired and directed the efforts to secure legislation looking to the confiscation of the ecclesiastical estates. Now, it must be admitted that the Lollards, as a body, sympathized with these efforts, and desired the alienation of the lands and other property of the hierarchy; but this was desired by the great mass of the party strictly as a matter of reform, and in the interests of evangelical religion. It was no socialistic scheme proceeding upon principles which menaced the very fabric of society, as some have alleged. So far is this from being true that, as we have seen, it was proposed to use the church endowments to strengthen the existing order in England, by creating estates out of it for a large number of earls, knights and esquires. What the Lollards had at heart was to make the church what Christ had ordained it should be—an institute for proclaiming the gospel to sinners, and for edifying the people of God and training them in holiness of life. This, they conceived, could be done only by making the clergy simple ministers of the Word, dependent upon the offerings of the people to whom they preached. Again, it must be noticed that this contention against church endowments was not the sole thing, nor yet the chief thing, for which the Lollards stood. The impression that it was such is naturally made by the fact that it is in connection with this, almost exclusively, that the Lollards are mentioned in the history of the times. Unfortunately, we have upon the pages of the historian usually only an account of the doings of princes and parliaments, pre-

lates and convocations, the quarrels of the great, and the wars whose end was the aggrandizement of the few. Where the Lollards touched this sphere of political life they became an object of interest to the chroniclers, and by consequence to those who have wrought up the materials furnished by the chroniclers. But no notice is taken of the fact that, while the Lollard knights were urging confiscation schemes in parliament, the humble Lollard preachers were going everywhere, with the Bible in their hands, teaching the simple gospel and warning men against the idolatry of the mass, saint and image worship, and reliance upon the merit of pilgrimages and other forms of will-worship. The great majority of those who had identified themselves with the movement were more interested in keeping themselves pure from the defilements of Rome, and learning what the Scriptures taught, than in anything else. That such was the case may be learned even from their enemies, whose indictment of them never fails to include the complaint that they despise the mass and saint and image worship as idolatrous; that they condemn pilgrimages to shrines, auricular confession, penance and absolution; and that they insist on reading, or hearing read, in the vernacular, the gospels, Paul's epistles, and other portions of the Scriptures.¹ It will be remembered that Sir John Oldecastle employed many scribes in multiplying copies of the Scriptures and of Wyclif's tracts for the people, and that he was obnoxious to the hierarchy chiefly on account of his fostering care of the Lollard movement as an *evangelical* movement. The charges brought against him and his confession of faith upon his trial alike show that it was not as a political agitator that he was arraigned, but as a professor and promulgator of the great truths of the gospel which witness against the teachings and practice of the Church of Rome.²

These hints, and many more like them, of which the historians have taken no account, reveal to us what was the real core and life of the Lollard movement in the first quarter of the fifteenth century. Devotion to the word of God and the truth it revealed; loyalty to Jesus Christ and zeal for the pure and simple worship

¹ Cf. Foxe's *Acts and Mon.*, III., 221-319.

² Foxe's *Acts and Mon.*, III., 326 *seq.*

which He had ordained as against the idolatrous inventions of Rome, these were the distinctive characteristics of the party then as always. It is a perversion, then, of the truth of history, based upon the most superficial view of the facts, to represent the Lollards as essentially a political party which ceased to bear witness to the great truths, zeal for which had given it birth.

The natural outcome, as we have seen, of this belief, that the *raison d'être* of the Lollard party had come to be political agitation, was the conclusion that, when its activity in this sphere was no longer recognized, the party itself had gone out of existence. The proof that it continued to exist, and that too with all its old vigor of life, is, at the same time, proof that its relation to such agitations was accidental, and that it was rooted in something deeper. We now pass on to the examination of the evidence bearing on this point.

2. The first evidence we would adduce for the continued existence of the Lollards as a religious party is furnished us by King Henry VI., in a writ issued by him in July, 1439.¹ This writ gives information that numerous pilgrims were accustomed to visit the spot, on Tower Hill, where Richard Wiche, an itinerant Lollard preacher, had been, some years before, burned to death for heresy. He had been greatly revered while alive, and having preached "in many places within the realm of England," was widely known. The writ recites that many declared that he died "a good, a just, and a holy man." There can be no question that those who honored him by visits to the place where he died were Lollards. The number of these pilgrims was considerable enough to create apprehensions that the dreaded Wyclifites might be conspiring, as once they were charged with doing in the days of Oldcastle. Moreover, there is an indication that they came from many portions of the country in the fact that copies of the writ were sent to all the sheriffs throughout the realm, charging them to prevent these admirers of Richard Wiche from coming up to London to do him honor. Where there was one pilgrim, especially from the more distant localities, there must have been many

¹ See the document in Foxe, III., 703.

more Lollards left at home. Indefinite as are the conclusions which we can draw from the data furnished by this writ as to numbers, it clearly indicates that the Lollards were not few, nor lacking in zeal for the truths to which Richard Wiche bore witness at the stake.

Passing over a period of ten years, we find in a book published in the year 1449, by Dr. Reginald Pecock, Bishop of Chichester, no little information concerning the Lollards. The title of the book of itself sufficiently indicates against whom it was directed: "The Repressor of over much blaming the Clergy." It is a polemic against the "Lay-party," or "Bible-men." The title by which these sectaries designated themselves, the bishop informs us, was "Known-men" (*i. e.*, *known of God*, or *elect*). This title makes it certain that they were Wyclifites, since they are represented as taking it from 1 Cor. xiv. 38, a passage which Wyclif mistranslates, "*If any man unknoweth, he schal be unknowen.*" Their doctrine, as Pecock represents it, was that without a knowledge of the Scriptures no man would be saved, but that those who knew the Scriptures were known of God, or "known-men." This implied that every man should have the Scriptures in his own tongue, and that every man could understand them by the help of God's Spirit without the intervention of the priest. Against this doctrine, that plain people can understand the Bible, Pecock lays out his strength. At great length and with every indication that he is dealing with no man of straw he assails this fundamental position of the Lollards. It is evident that he is contending against a strong party which threatens to take out of the hands of the learned the interpretation of the Scriptures. Here, then, in the middle of the fifteenth century, nearly twenty years after the time at which Mr. Froude declares the sect organized by Wyclif sank into darkness without leaving a trace except a "black memory" behind it, there were numerous "known-men," who held and propagated the very doctrines which the Lollards had been teaching from the beginning: ¹ persons who insisted upon the right and the ability of plain men to know the word of God for themselves,

¹ He names them Lollards, in at least one passage: "*The erring persoones of the lay peple which ben clepid Lollardis.*"—*Repressor*, I. Part, Chap. 20.

and to preach the gospel, and who despised and rejected the Romish clergy.¹

A third ground of inference is furnished us by the extant manuscripts of the whole or parts of Wyclif's Bible. There are still in existence thirty such MSS., which were made between the years 1430 and 1440, and twenty others which belong to the period from 1440 to 1450.² What is the significance of the fact that these fifty MSS. from this time still remain to us?

Let the reader consider what proportion of the manuscripts actually made was likely to survive the three hundred years, and more, before any special care was taken to preserve these remains. Let him consider that for one hundred years, and more, from the beginning of this period Wyclif's Bible was a proscribed book, and that strenuous and repeated efforts were made to destroy it. Many of those who possessed these precious manuscripts were required to cast them into the flames, and it had happened more than once that great bonfires were made of the English Scriptures and other books belonging to the Lollards.³ Will it be considered extravagant, in view of the lapse of time during which many manuscripts must have perished by use, by various accidents, and especially by systematic efforts to destroy every copy of Wyclif's Bible, to say that these fifty MSS. are the survival of many hundreds made during that period? But, further, it must be remembered that there were already in existence very many copies of the English Scriptures before 1430, which continued in use during the time of which we are now speaking. There are still extant

¹ For a short but excellent *resumé* of the opinions of the Lollards of this period, as gathered from Pecoock's *Repressor*, see *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Art. Lollards: cf. Lechler's *Johann von Wiclif und die Vorgeschichte der Reformation*. II., 371-399 and 422-426.

² Forshall and Madden's *Wyclifite Versions*, I., Introduction.

³ About the year 1540 there appeared in Italy a book entitled "On the Benefits of Christ's Death," setting forth the doctrine of justification by faith. Ranke (*History of Popes*, p. 38,) informs us that it had "an incredible success." Hundreds of thousands of copies were circulated, but, so utterly was it expunged by the efforts of the church, that when Ranke wrote he could say that not a trace of the work existed. Since that time (1834) two or three copies have been discovered. (See Häusser's *Period of the Reformation*, p. 274.) This may serve to suggest how many MSS. of Wyclif's Bible perished.

twenty-five MSS. made during the first quarter of the fifteenth century, and many others of an earlier date.¹ All these, and many more as old as they which have perished, were in the hands of the Lollards of that day. Taking all these considerations into account, it would seem fair to conclude that, in 1450, there were in the possession of persons connected with this sect several thousand copies of the whole or a part of the English Bible.

But, further, it must not be forgotten that this was an age when a large proportion of the people could not read. Although the Lollards made special efforts in this direction, if we may judge from certain hints dropped by confessors at a later date, we must conclude that, owing to the poverty of the great majority of them, and consequent lack of opportunity, the proportion among them of those who could read was probably not much above the average. In fact, we find on record later abundant evidence to this point in the frequently recurring charge brought against accused persons that they had read the gospels or Paul's epistles to others. One chief object of the frequent secret meetings of the Lollards was that the Scriptures might be read for the benefit of those who were dependent upon this means of becoming acquainted with them. There must have been, then, very many more Lollards than there were copies of Wyclif's Bible. Doubtless many who could read them did not possess books of their own, for they were costly. We have in this fact abundant grounds for concluding that, in the middle of the fifteenth century, the Lollards were numerous,—probably as numerous as they had ever been.

The facts with which we have been dealing bring us to the eve of the War of the Roses, which agitated England for thirty years (1455–1485). It is not strange that in such a time little note should be taken of these humble and unobtrusive people. But that they still lived and loved the word of God in those dark days of revolution and bloodshed, is proved by other manuscripts of Wyclif's Bible made during those years and still in existence. In the very year of the triumph of Henry Tudor (1485) persecution began again in England; and at once the evidence of the existence and activity of the Lollards becomes abundant. A number of per-

¹ Forshall and Madden's *Wyclifite Versions*, I., Introduction.

sons in the See of Coventry and Lichfield were arraigned before the bishop upon accusations which identify them unmistakably with the Lollards.¹ Nine years later, an aged woman was burned at Smithfield as a disciple of Wyclif.² Thus, in this place so noted in the annals of martyrdom, were lighted the fires which were not to go out finally until more than a century had passed away.

As showing how widely the influence of Wyclif's teachings had spread, it may be mentioned that in this same year (1494) thirty persons were summoned by the Archbishop of Glasgow before King James IV. of Scotland and his council, upon charges which show them to have been Lollards. These charges may be read in John Knox's History of the Reformation in Scotland,³ where the alleged heretics are called the "Lollards of Kyle." From another source we learn that these opinions were "spreading rapidly throughout the kingdom, especially in the western districts of Kyle, Carrick, and Cunningham."⁴

At Amersham, in Buckinghamshire, sixty persons were, in 1506, condemned as Lollards. Their chief teacher, William Tylsworth, was burned, his own daughter being compelled to light the fire, while his entire flock bore fagots in token of their deserving the same fate.⁵ In the diocese of London the work of persecution went on during all the early years of the sixteenth century. The Bishop of Lincoln made more than one cruel attack upon the Lollards, and many were weak enough to abjure and make their peace with the church.⁶ Many pages of the "Acts and Monuments" are filled with accounts of these persecutions, which antedate the beginning of the Reformation in Germany. The question arises: How are we to account for the activity of the hierarchy at this time against the Lollards? The only satisfactory explanation is that they were growing in numbers and were winning to their views many persons from the bosom of the church. There is reason to believe that not a few priests in orders were in full sympathy with them.

¹ Foxe, *Acts and Mon.*, IV., 133-135. ² Foxe, IV., 7. ³ Book I., *ad init.*

⁴ Hetherington, *History of the Church of Scotland*, ch. II.

⁵ Foxe, IV., 123, 124. The martyrologist declares that at the time he wrote there were still alive in the town of Amersham both men and women who were witnesses of the execution of Tylsworth.

⁶ Foxe, IV., 214.

What else could it be besides their rapidly increasing numbers and their greater boldness and activity that provoked the measures against them? This presumption is largely confirmed when we come to read the story of the itinerant preacher, Thomas Man, who perished at Smithfield in March, 1518.¹ He had been arrested, tried, and silenced by imprisonment, in 1511, but had subsequently escaped and pursued his calling again for a time. His chief activity belongs, however, to the period before 1511. On his last trial it appeared in evidence against him that "he had been in divers places and counties in England, and had instructed very many, as at Amersham, at London, at Billericary, at Chelmsford, at Stratford-Langthorn, at Uxbridge, at Henly-upon-Thames, in Suffolk and Norfolk, at Newbury, and divers places more, where he himself testifieth that as he went westward he found a great company of well-disposed persons, being of the same judgment touching the Lord's Supper that he was of," etc. Man declared that "he had turned seven hundred people to his religion and doctrine, for which he thanked God." This was the sort of zeal and activity which doubtless characterized many an earnest and faithful evangelist. It is not strange that such efforts, and such fruits attending, aroused the hierarchy to renewed efforts against the sect.

Shortly after Luther had entered upon his career as a reformer, when his books began to appear in England, and his influence began to be felt, the zeal of the persecutors was quickened all the more. Among those most forward in this business, must be mentioned John Longland, Bishop of Lincoln. Foxe² has preserved for us some pages from this prelate's register for the year 1521, in which we read the names of several hundred people who were charged with heresy, together with the matters that were laid in information against them, under the system of espionage which he organized. It is with some surprise that we find in this record not the least evidence that any one of those accused had been influenced by Luther, or the movement which had been going forward for more than three years in Germany. They are all simple laboring people, with no point of contact with that learned circle which had begun to read Luther's books and imbibe his principles. They are

¹ Foxe, IV., 208-214.

² *Acts and Monuments*, IV., 219-246.

charged with reading the Scriptures in English (*i. e.*, Wyclif's Bible) and "Wyclif's Wicket"; with rejecting the doctrine of the real presence in the eucharist, as well as pilgrimages to shrines, the worship of images, and like matters. We learn that they were accustomed to meet together secretly to hear the Scriptures read and expounded; that they repudiated utterly the pretensions of the Romish clergy, and maintained the right of laymen to preach and administer the sacraments. These were the doctrines of the Lollards and it is evident that these persons, who called themselves "known-men," as the disciples of Wyclif had done a century before, were simply Lollards. Luther's movement, which was beginning to agitate the great literary centres of Cambridge and Oxford, had not yet touched the plane on which they moved.

In speaking of the English Reformation, it is customary to recognize two distinct elements which combined to make England a Protestant country. The one was the movement, more political than religious, by which Henry VIII. cast aside the papal supremacy and made himself the head of a separate, national English Church; the other was the evangelical movement, which, taking occasion of this politico-ecclesiastical revolution, transformed the corrupt English Establishment into a Reformed Church. Little notice has been taken, however, of the fact that the evangelical movement itself was two-fold in its origin. The history of one of these we have traced from its beginnings to the Reformation period. The other, and younger, branch of the evangelical party in England may be said to have taken its impulse from the publication of the Greek Testament of Erasmus, in the year 1516. The revival of learning had prepared the way at Oxford and Cambridge, and a number of young men in these seats of learning were brought under the power of saving truth by the perusal of the Greek Scriptures. Then came the powerful tracts and expositions of Luther, to confirm and help forward the work which was already on the way. Thus there gradually grew up in England a considerable body of earnest, evangelical men, who were at the same time learned and able preachers of the gospel. Among these was William Tyndale, who early conceived the idea of translating the Scriptures from the original Hebrew and Greek into the English

tongue. It was he who, through his version of the Bible, gave a new impulse to the Lollard movement, and prepared it to become the leaven which contributed more than all other influences besides towards leavening the whole lump.

We have seen how the "known-men" had loved the Scriptures during all the century and a half since the poor priests first went forth with Wyclif's version to proclaim the gospel. But there had never been, we may believe, an adequate supply of these manuscripts; and, besides, the considerable cost of a transcript of the entire Bible or of even the whole New Testament forced many to content themselves with copies of the four gospels, or of Paul's epistles, or some other fragment of the Scriptures. Moreover, with all its merits, Wyclif's version had the defects of a translation from a translation. But from 1526 onward, the New Testament, and a few years later the Old Testament as well, in a version practically the same as that from which we read to-day, could be procured for a price within the means of all.

It was not long after the first copies of Tyndale's New Testament found their way into England from the continent, where they were printed, that the demand for them entirely outran the supply. So extraordinary was this demand that first one printer in Antwerp, and a little later several others, undertook the publication of the book as a business investment. The result was that soon thousands of copies of the New Testament were sold in England, in spite of all the strenuous efforts of Wolsey and the other churchmen to exclude it. Now it was the Lollards who, through eagerness to procure this improved translation, in large measure created this demand. The natural results followed. They continued to increase in numbers as well as in the depth and ardor of their piety, and their influence became more powerful than ever. Their "conventicles" were multiplied, and from being mere assemblies they came to be organizations. They were now called "congregations," being made up of believers only, and patterned after the model of the apostolic churches.¹ Their meetings were still, of necessity, secret, as in those earlier days when the "conventicula occulta" had been held in lonely peasant houses, or in pits and

¹ Conant, *History of English Bible*, p. 175.

caves of the earth,¹ for there was no place for them in Henry VIII.'s church, any more than there had been place for them in the Church of Rome during the reign of the representatives of the House of Lancaster.

As Tyndale's Version had communicated a new impulse to the Lollards, so it became a bond between them and the evangelical body of learned men, already mentioned, of whom Tyndale was one. Most of these were preachers; and when they went forth, as many of them did, like Wyclif's simple priests, with the English Bible in their hands, the Lollards furnished, in large measure, the audiences which heard them. Thomas Bilney was a pioneer in this work. When, in 1532, John Frith, whose name is inseparably associated with that of Tyndale, returned secretly to England from the continent, he seems to have had for his mission to visit the congregations as a kind of representative of Tyndale.

As the years went on, it became more and more evident that Henry VIII. was inexorably opposed to any real evangelical reform. This was made sufficiently plain by the Ten Articles of 1536, which constituted the first doctrinal deliverance of the Church of England after the rupture with Rome.² Three years later, the Six Articles appeared, which re-asserted the essential points of the Romish system, denounced death against all who should deny transubstantiation, and made imprisonment, confiscation of goods, or death, according to the degree of guilt, the penalty of rejecting other articles.³ The effect of this could not fail to be the creation of a closer bond between all evangelical christians. The party of reformers, which had originated in the impulse given by the new learning and by the appearance of the Greek Testament of Erasmus, and had been strengthened by the influence of Luther, split into two sections. One consisted of those who had not got far enough upon the way to see clearly that there was no compromise with Rome, or of temporizers whose eyes were blinded by their vivid sense of the supreme importance of pleasing the king. The other section was composed of those who had gone the whole length demanded by logical consistency, and felt compelled to reject every one of the Six Articles as irreconcilably opposed to the word of

¹ Lechler, II., 307.

² Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, I., 611.

³ *Ibid.*, 613.

God. This second section of the party now coalesced with the older evangelical party of the Lollards, and lifted it up towards its own plane socially and intellectually. The despised "gospellers," as those who preached without the authority of the church were called, were no longer all of them unlettered rustics, but many were suited to shine in any circle; and among their hearers were not a few representatives of the middle and the higher classes.

Upon the accession of Edward VI. in 1547, those of the reformers who had compromised themselves and thus retained their connection with the church under Henry, became predominant in the Court Church party. It was they who, under the lead of Cranmer, directed the reforms in the Establishment. They manifested their sympathy with the old order of things by adopting, as nearly as possible, the ritual of Rome, but in an English dress. They showed the influence of the strict evangelical party in the creed which they gave to the church, which in almost every particular reflects the views of those who had identified themselves with the disciples of Wyclif.

Turning once more to those whom we may continue, with propriety, to call the Lollards, there is reason to believe that they still preserved the organization of their congregations. During the persecution of Mary's reign they reappear, and most probably they had never been disbanded. The Lollards, however, now made a decided approach towards the church. They hoped for its complete reformation, and were anxious to hasten it by their presence and coöperation. Thus partially identified with the Establishment, but not entirely incorporated with it, they exerted the powerful influence upon it which has already been alluded to.

Speaking now more particularly of that influence, to it must be attributed the fact that English Protestantism, in rejecting transubstantiation, did not accept in its stead the views of Luther on the real presence, but adopted the scriptural doctrine of the spiritual presence of Christ in the supper. We have only to read the story of the persecutions of the Lollards, from the day when Wyclif was excluded from his chair at Oxford down to the close of Henry's reign, to learn that one chief subject of their witnessing was that the bread and wine continued to be bread and wine after their consecration by the priest, and that Christ was present in no cor-

poreal sense but only to the faith of the worthy communicant. It was this doctrine, for which not a few of them had died in recent years, that they gave to the learned men who made common cause with them, when they could find no home in Henry's church. When Edward VI. came to the throne, and England first took her place among the Protestant peoples, it was not long before she was recognized as standing upon the Reformed side of the great sacramentarian controversy which had divided continental Protestantism into two hostile camps. In the very year of Edward's accession, and the next, several prominent theologians who had suffered upon the continent for their rejection of the Lutheran doctrine found a refuge in England. It was in the year 1548 that Cranmer, by the influence quite as much of native divines as of the foreign, adopted the Reformed view, and so it found its way into the Forty-two (later Thirty-nine) Articles. The doctrine of the eucharist was, thus, not imposed from above, but fought its way from the lowly conventicles of the Lollards up to the archiepiscopal seat of Canterbury, to the court of Edward, and then into the Creed of the church.

It would be difficult to over-estimate the importance of this fact, that the evangelical party in England rejected the Lutheran real presence, and adopted the view which brought them into sympathy with the Swiss Reformers. It was due to this not only that Peter Martyr, Martin Bucer, and other Reformed divines, found their way to England and exerted a great influence, but it was also due to this, that when Hooper fled from England after the promulgation of the Bloody Articles, he found his way finally to Zurich, where he was fortified by Bullinger in the views which made him "the first Puritan Confessor." To this also is to be attributed the fact that, when the persecution under Mary began, the exiles, eight hundred in number, were repelled by the Lutherans, and therefore had to find places of refuge among the Reformed. It was in this way that many of them came under the direct influence of Calvin in Geneva. They received much from Calvin and the other theologians at whose feet they sat; but it was rather in the way of development and confirmation of the principles for which they stood before, and which had descended to them from Wyclif through the Lollards.

Upon their return to England the congregations, which in Mary's day had fallen back again upon the lay readers and preachers, heard them gladly. The hopes of a complete reformation of the Church, cut short by the death of Edward, revived under Elizabeth; and now there was heard more distinctly the enunciation of that great principle which lay at the basis of Wyclif's revolt from Rome, to-wit: that the Scriptures constitute the supreme guide of the church, both in faith and practice. The Lollards, proceeding on this principle, when they could not secure the reform of the church, but were cast out and persecuted, retired from view as completely as they could, and worshipped God according to the simple model set forth in His word. But these Lollards of Elizabeth's reign, with all the aggressiveness of the earlier days of the party, and with all the weight that learning added to intense conviction could give them, insisted that the Church of England should become a reformed church, not only in its creed, but also in its polity and forms of worship. This could be done only by the rejection of everything not expressly set down in Scripture, or to be deduced therefrom by good and necessary inference. Whereas Hooper had objected only to vestments, the Puritans of Elizabeth's day were bent upon the abolition of the hierarchy and the exclusion of the prayer-book. Whereas Hooper protested against the vestments chiefly because they were associated in the popular mind with the idolatries of Rome, these later Protestants waged their battle against what they considered to be positively unlawful, as finding no warrant in the word of God. This is the legitimate outcome of Wyclif's principle. It was simply the old Lollard protest in its developed form and carried to its logical consequences.

Thus it appears that the Puritans were only the Lollards re-inforced from the ranks of the learned, helped forward by the great reformers of the sixteenth century, but still the Lollards, uttering the same protests, witnessing for the same truths, planting their feet upon the same fundamental principle as they had done from the days of Wyclif himself. The Puritans of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and the Puritans of to-day, are all the children of "Wyclif, a Puritan of the Puritans before there was a Puritan."

J. F. LATIMER.

II. THE MAJESTY OF LAW.

BUT what is law? Passing by definitions that are merely technical, it is in the last analysis the authoritative expression of a personal will. The terms are carefully chosen; for there are wills to be resisted, because incapable of enforcement by any recognized authority and tending to the disintegration of society. The will to be obeyed carries with it a sanction through which it is bound upon the conscience, and this makes it law. But it is idle to speak of a will apart from a personal being in whom it resides. If there be a law, there must be a law-giver standing behind it conscious alike of purpose and of power. We might as well cut off the stream from the fountain whence it issues, as sever the connection between the law and the personal will of which it is only the expression.

It would be a truism to affirm this, did we not have just here a notable instance of that "fatal imposture of words" by which the counterfeit is smuggled into the place of the true. In the fondness with which we recognize the reign of law, we are tempted to think and speak of it as though itself were the king, instead of being the mere edict of a king. We exaggerate it into a living entity with personal attributes, and originating within itself the force which it is simply empowered to define and regulate. It is an illusion of our own rhetoric, when we forget it is only a personification to say that the law does this or that. Nay, the very title of this article imposes the same deception, since it is only by a metaphor we transfer the majesty of the sovereign to the instrument by which he rules. However universal, then, the law may be in its presence, however constant in its influence, however uniform in its operation, however supreme in its obligation, it must emanate from a source higher than itself. The intelligence with which it is framed for a given end, and the authority by which it is enforced, are properties of an agent, however hidden from our sight, to whose counsel and power they may be referred. Take

up at random any book which touches this matter, and we will see the impossibility of avoiding the terms which imply this necessary connection. Horne Tooke, for example, deduces the word "law" from a root in the Anglo-Saxon which means "laid down," as the rule of conduct. Richard Hooker, in his "Ecclesiastical Polity," amplifies the definition of law thus: "That which doth assign unto each thing the kind, that which doth moderate the force and power, that which doth appoint the form and measure of working, the same we term law." In both cases, the language distinguishes between the rule and the authority which lays it down; between "the form and measure of working" and the power which appoints the same. Decisions still more ancient may be cited from the treatise of Cicero, "de Legibus." In the first Book, Section 6, he defines thus: "*Lex est ratio summa, insita in natura, quae jubet ea quae facienda sunt, prohibetque contraria. Eadem ratio cum est in hominis mente confirmata et confecta, lex est.*" Here, then, is law on the broadest scale, both as it is physical and instinctive, and as it is intellectual and moral. In either case, its commanding power is due to a superior intelligence by which it is enjoined. Even more precisely, in the third Book of the same treatise, Cicero connects the law with the authority which proclaims it: "*Vereque dici potest, magistratum legem esse loquentem, legem autem mutum magistratum.*" The law is nothing apart from the magistrate, nor the magistrate apart from the law, the two being distinguished in their very coördination. If this elaboration be deemed unnecessary, let it be accepted as a protest against the tendency of modern scientific thought, at least in the more extravagant of its schools, to invest the laws of nature with an undue supremacy above the Being by whom they were ordained.

On the contrary, the law finds the height of its grandeur in this fundamental conception of it, as the expression of a personal will. For as law rises above law in constant gradation, we must ascend from lower to higher until we arrive at the will which is the supreme source of all authority. We rise, for example, from municipal law, resting upon the will of a corporation, to statutory law, resting upon the legislation of a commonwealth; and from this to constitutional law, resting upon the sovereignty of the peo-

ple in the exercise of an original right to ordain their own system of government. But when this supreme human authority has been reached, law has not yet discovered the source from which it springs. No human government would be possible, unless man had been antecedently in subjection under the Divine. The truth cannot be too firmly pronounced that obedience, in every form and degree, grounds in the religious nature of man. The very terms by which man is defined as a responsible agent show him to have been created a subject under law. The sphere of his activity is described in the very faculties with which he is endowed, becoming a law to him, mapping out the relations he must sustain and the duties which are their natural outgrowth. This statement calls for no expansion. There is, for example, the faculty of will upon which the autonomy of man's being depends; it is only the will of a creature at best, which must bow in submission to the will which is supreme. And there is conscience, which has no place among the powers of the soul and is but a solemn impertinence, except as it is the organ of law and the interpreter of duty. Here, then, in the very frame of his being, we find man organized for obedience to authority under a jurisdiction from which there is no escape. It is this antecedent recognition of the Divine supremacy which renders him capable of control, and without whose aid no earthly government would be able to bridle his passions or to subdue his haughty independence. We thus mount through human legislation to the stepping-stones of the eternal throne, and find the shadow of its authority resting as the sanction of law, under all the forms in which it is administered upon earth.

Let us pause before the splendor of this generalization. We found behind every law a personal will of which it is the authoritative expression. We have ascended from one legal height to another, until the last induction yielded the supreme law from which all the rest were seen to flow. This, in turn, revealed the will of a Being uncaused and underived, whose necessary existence and creative power our philosophy itself must postulate in order to account for all else that exists. It is not only a will solitary in its grandeur, but glorious in the supreme wisdom which directs it, in the sublime goodness which impels it, and in the infinite power

which executes it. "God is light," and from the bosom of its whiteness rises the majestic form of the law, crowned with the splendor of His own glory. Here we are at the topmost reach of human thought, where reason kindles her torch at the light which is eternal, and bows with adoring rapture in the presence of the Divine.

2. The grandeur of law is further seen in its universal prevalence, over kingdoms the most diverse and with adaptations endlessly various. We have signalized as yet only moral law, addressed to intelligence and to which conscience responds. But there is law in the domain of matter as well as of mind, law which operates over blind and unconscious force. The immense scope and absolute supremacy of law within this sphere can only be appreciated through the magnificent and recent disclosures of physical science; whose province it is to observe the uniform procedures of nature, to register the laws and to describe the forces by which these are conducted. There is the law which floats the atom in the sunbeam, and the law which balances the planets in their orbits. There is the law which mysteriously builds the crystal into rhomboid, cube or prism, and the law which deposits the layers of solid rock beneath the crust of the earth. There is the law which forms the pearl of dew upon the rose of summer, and the law which rolls up the mighty tides from the heart of the sea.

"That very law which moulds a tear,
And bids it trickle from its source ;
That law preserves the earth a sphere,
And guides the planets in their course."

It is idle to press the enumeration, for where can we turn in the world of nature, without being confronted with the presence of imperial law? But there are laws as well in the intellectual and moral sphere: laws of mind by which we trace the birth of every thought and the secret spring of every emotion. There are laws of memory, laws of conscience, laws of the will, laws of society, laws of commerce, laws for the production and distribution of wealth, laws of diplomacy, laws of national greatness and decay, laws of war and laws of peace, laws of honor, laws of friendship and of love. But where shall the breathless catalogue end? Not

until with reason's loftiest flight we take refuge beneath the will of the Infinite Supreme, whose all-embracing law is diffused through the universe as the air through space.

It is not only this diffusion, but the enfolding of law within law, which fills the mind with astonishment. We find ourselves involved in a system where all individual laws are the single threads woven and knotted together into a vast net-work. We draw back, almost in fear, from the microscope which discloses in the drop of purest water a world of life, the prototypes of those huge monsters that lash the sea into foam in the fury of their rage. Science is converted almost into magic, when it shows in the feathery snow the same factors that compose the ragged boulder upon the mountain side; or when the dirty coal, dug from the bowels of the earth, claims full equality with the diamond flashing its lustre, like the gleam of the human eye, upon the brow of beauty. Wonder deepens into awe, as the spectroscope reveals the texture of those distant stars, making them akin to this dull earth and establishing the homogeneity of the universe. It startles one to learn that the very worlds themselves are bound together in family relationship, by virtue of the same birth, in the same mould, through the operation of the same law.

We are ascending a grand stairway to the largest generalization of physical science. Not only do we discover law, in some form, wherever we turn our gaze, but we are overwhelmed with surprise and delight in tracing the extension of the same law as far as the exploration of the universe has been carried. The same principle of attraction, for example, which brings a stone to the earth, prevails as the bond which holds planets in their orbits sweeping in the void immense; and what is more worthy to be noted, it is found to work under the same rule of proportion, expressed by the same formula, as upon the surface of our globe. The vast power of the telescope reveals another extension of the same law. It has resolved some of those cloud-like appearances upon the distant sky into clusters of stars, bound together in the same harmony as our own solar system, and moving in appointed orbits around their central suns. It has not been enough to people space with these uncounted worlds; but they are grouped into vast

families, with domestic ties which relate them to their respective centres and define the spheres in which they shall be subordinated. Even this is not all. These associated systems themselves sweep, with a common movement, around a more distant centre still, which attracts and confines them all, but in orbits so vast that ages are required to mark their slow but steady progression. Our solar system, it is stated, has travelled, since the creation, over only one three-thousandth part of its immense orbit, though moving at the rate of 28,000 miles per hour, and requiring a period of more than eighteen millions of years to complete the entire circuit. Thus not only worlds upon worlds revolve, "orb upon orb," but worlds grouped into tribes, "cycle upon epicycle," until thought reels under the mighty suggestion that the burning throne of the Infinite Creator is the pivot upon which the universe is balanced—the centre from which all the paths are described in which unnumbered worlds move in perfect harmony, the source of that eternal power which gives to all force its energy, and to all law its form. For what if the splendid prophecy of science should be verified, that the mysterious forces which we discover everywhere working under definite rules, should be only modifications of one single and comprehensive force, ordained by Infinite Power as the spring of all the activities we behold? Thus broad and splendid are the steps of that inductive reasoning by which we "ascend from Nature up to Nature's God."

Can there be anything grander than this? To see the worlds, as they are balanced in empty space, all formed of one material and thus akin to each other in their most distant removes; to behold them swayed by the same subtle forces, working under the same rule and measure; to view them in their silent circuits, obedient to one supreme principle as the bond of their allegiance to the Infinite Will which controls them all: can there be a climax higher than this? Yes, we must rise into another realm of thought; we must soar above the physical into the moral sphere; we must regard law, not as expressing mere power and will, but the whole character of the Deity—that which announces the fundamental distinction betwixt right and wrong; which defines the relations, and expounds the duties of intelligent and responsible beings. It

is scarcely necessary to say that such a law, springing from the very nature of God, must be one and singular. There can no more be two laws for the moral universe than there can be two Gods. To all beings in all worlds, "endued with sanctity of reason," it must be the perfect standard of rectitude, the infallible expounder of duty, and the absolute measure of obligation. To whatever extent the conditions may vary in which these beings are placed, to the same extent may this law be modified in the details of its application; but it must ever remain the same in its principle and root, making the same exactions and imposing the same terms upon all beneath its sway. What is there in the widest extension of physical law comparable with this absolute universality of the moral? The one depends upon the simple determination of the Divine will, which was perfectly free to have ordained otherwise; the other springs out of the Divine character itself, and cannot be cancelled even in thought. The one is carried on from world to world, until the fancy is lost in the immensity which it seeks to explore; the other clings to us as an immediate truth, bound to the understanding by the deduction of an inexorable logic.

A weird spell is thrown upon the soul when it comes to feel the presence of this universal, yet unseen, law. Viewless as the air, yet stretching around and beyond us to the infinite, we are overwhelmed by it as by the thought of space. We are in space, and feel its boundary around us; yet it stretches on to the eternal, in which it is merged and lost for ever; so this universal law surrounds with its authority, and in its diffusion we feel that we are covered with the omnipresence of the Deity.

3. Consider now the majesty of law from its *under* rather than its *upper* side, as the codification of all the decisions of the human conscience. This conscience has the two-fold office to discharge of witness and judge, both depending upon its responsive character, as the organ of law. It recognizes the distinction betwixt right and wrong, as the understanding distinguishes between the true and the false, or the taste between the beautiful and the deformed. It pre-supposes a standard for its guidance, just as truth must exist in order to knowledge. Man is so made in the image of his Creator that all his attributes reflect the Divine, as the shadow is the

dim outline of the substance which casts it. There is a quality of justice in man which answers to the justice that is in God, as there is a pity which is the echo of the Divine compassion; and conscience is the lower tribunal upon earth, which affirms the decisions of the supreme court above. It thus becomes the detective that dogs the steps of the transgressor; lifting the voice of warning, or taking the silent testimony upon which the judicial sentence shall be rendered. The inextinguishable vitality of our moral convictions is their marvellous and alarming feature. The memory upon which, like an ancient palimpsest, a thousand inscriptions have been superimposed, will disclose them all before the judicial fires whenever they are kindled. The conscience, which has been debauched or drugged with opiates, will awake at last with its scorpion sting to take reprisal for the wrong it has endured. Not an atom of dust can escape from the control of law; and man, the priest of nature, must lead the creatures in the recognition of law as eternal as the Being who gave it.

Human legislation thus becomes the mirror of the Divine, distorted though the image be; just as the troubled sea reflects, though with saddest wrinkles, the face of the sky. Whatever, then, may be alleged against the imperfection of human law and the uncertainty of human justice, they are invested with a superb dignity as the response which man makes to the authority of the Supreme Ruler. It is the human conscience making its tally against all the requirements of infinite justice; registering on earth what man approves as just and true and noble and good; and holding up the record for the scrutiny of Heaven. It is not for us to accuse, or to vindicate, the law as administered by weak and erring man. It may be a blurred transcript of what is written in a fairer text in the chancery above; but that it is a transcript at all, through the interpretation of the untrammelled conscience, gives to the law a human glory which is the counterpart of the Divine. Man rises, through his vexed career, with an ethical code responding, in its measure, to the law of infinite rectitude: a code not expressed in feeble advice, but in commands enforced by sanctions of its own. The majesty of man's moral nature, then, goes over to the law which is the expression of his attributes, pre-

cisely as the seal of Divine majesty is stamped upon the superior law of which this is but the echo.

4. We take up the law again in its widest scope, as the trusted guardian of both human and Divine interests, now and for ever. Pope has written "order is heaven's first law"; nay, rather it may be said, it is the end or purpose for which law itself is framed. The power which at first produced the elements, must hold them in their due proportion mixed, or the universe would be dissolved in the fierceness of their strife. This control is exerted through what we term "natural law," by which

"The heavens themselves, the planets, and this centre,
Observe degree, priority, and place,
Insisture, course, proportion, season, form,
Office, and custom, in all line of order."

It affords food for deep reflection why, in the constitution of inert and senseless matter, forces are introduced between which the balance of power must be firmly held to avoid a worse than dynamite explosion. Are these materials of its own destruction placed in the frame-work of our globe, for ends strictly disciplinary and moral, that it may be purged for higher and purer destinies hereafter? These are questions to be remanded to theological, rather than scientific, investigation; and they are to be answered only through a supernatural testimony. They are not raised for consideration in this article, but only to indicate the vast issues which are involved in the preservation even of natural law.

A more fearful peril was incurred, when a being was created with the power of will. He may well tremble who appreciates the reach of those faculties which make man so august among the creatures. Does thought in man reflect the intelligence which is in God? Is conscience the polished mirror, upon which is playing the iridescence of infinite purity itself? What, then, is will in man, but the shadow of the Divine omnipotence?—the power by which we become creators upon our scale, and pour the contents of our being into acts that are imperishable for ever. The choice to obey includes the choice to rebel; and this clash of wills involves consequences far more dreadful than the war of elements in the

material universe. Let the ruling hand be withdrawn of Him who first called order out of chaos, and

“The bounded waters shall lift their bosoms higher than the shores,
And make a sop of all this solid globe.
Strength shall be lord of imbecility,
And the rude son shall strike his father dead.
Force shall be right ; or, rather, right and wrong,
(Between whose endless jar justice resides,)
Shall lose their names, and so shall justice too.
Then everything includes itself in power,
Power into will, will into appetite ;
And appetite an universal wolf,
So doubly seconded with will and power,
Must make perforce an universal prey,
And, last, eat up himself.”

It is the genius of Shakspeare which thus describes the universal wreck, in the destruction of universal law.

We may bring the matter nearer home. Around what various interests does not human law throw its daily protection? It silences the tongue of slander, and throws its shield over injured innocence. It restrains violence, and uncovers fraud. It represses crime, and checks the outburst of evil passions. It becomes the orphan's guardian and the widow's counsellor. It opens the prison-door to them that are bound, and provides a sanctuary for the oppressed. It purges society of its recurring disorders, and renders it possible to live. What honor then attaches to law, from this sacred guardianship of human rights! And if there are Divine rights as well, how necessary the wider law into whose custody these are committed! The suggestion is almost oppressive—these rights of God, lapping over the boundary of time and reaching into the stretches of eternity; the right to be, and to be supreme; to reign through the single power of His thought, without the contradiction or rivalry of any other will. Can law be more honored than to be charged with responsibilities vast and enduring as these? If it be grand, as the guardian of human and earthly interests, how superb in its maintenance of prerogatives so supreme as those of the Infinite Ruler!

This supremacy of law is, moreover, upheld in the face of continual insurrection. Account for it as we may, the explosive forces

in nature are ever breaking from control into paroxysms of destructive fury. Lightnings cleave the sky, tempests sweep the sea, earthquakes rend the solid earth, cyclones cut their fatal swath through the forest, pestilence and death scatter their seeds in the air. All nature is convulsed as in the agony of dissolution, as the sworn neutrality is broken in the clash of contending elements. But as sudden as the outburst, the violence is spent. The refractory powers are bound over to keep the peace, and the calm of nature is restored. Behold the supremacy of law, in grappling with these fierce contentions and composing them to rest. Nay, rather, view the omnipotence of law, which not only bridles the tempest and the storm, but with richer compensation converts them into ministers of blessing to an otherwise stagnant world.

Not less does law assert its supremacy in the moral sphere. Account for it as we may, the contingency has happened that man, in the audacity of his own choice, resolves to make "his mind his kingdom, and his will his law." As the result of this independence, the worst passions of the heart have broken forth into deeds of violence and crime, and war has deluged the earth with blood. Yet, as in the natural world, these strifes go by; the law resumes its sway, and a riper civilization marks the progress of the ages. If there be an historic deduction more certain than another, it is that law will hold its own against the caprices of nature and the wilfulness of man; never relaxing its guardianship of rights committed to its trust, and revealing its supremacy through the insurrections which it overrules.

It becomes every man, therefore, to be loyal to the throne of the Great King, and to consent to no dismemberment of His boundless domain. We are to accept no teachings which wrest any part of nature from the grasp of His authority. And those who dispense justice at human tribunals should remember that civil jurisprudence is but a province of that broad empire over which law presides; that they constitute a priesthood ministering not at an earthly altar only, but at the high altar of eternity, in the maintenance of universal law. They should be clothed with its purity as with the linen ephod of the ancient priest, and with its majesty as with the judicial ermine. In no better terms can

the majesty of law be set forth than in the words of Hooker's impressive eulogy: "Of law there can be no less acknowledged than that her seat is the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the world. All things in heaven and earth do her homage—the very least as feeling her care, and the greatest as not exempt from her power: both angels and men, and creatures of what condition soever, though each in different sort and manner, yet all with uniform consent, admiring her as the mother of their peace and joy."

B. M. PALMER.

III. THE WORD OF GOD VERSUS "THE BIBLE OF MODERN SCIENTIFIC THEOLOGY."

WE are accustomed to speak of the Scriptures as the Word of God. The Larger Catechism declares: "The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the word of God, the only rule of faith and practice." Our Lord denounces the Pharisees for "making the word of God of none effect through their traditions" (Mark vii. 13). And David, long before our Lord's day, wrote, "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path" (Psa. cxix. 105). Thus it will be seen that the application of the title "The Word of God" to the Scriptures is made on the highest authority, and is almost as old as the Scriptures themselves.

THE WORD OF GOD.

I. The grounds on which this application of the title "The Word of God" to the Scriptures is made, is set forth in such passages as the following, viz.: "All scripture is given by inspiration of God" (2 Tim iii. 16). "God who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son" (Heb. i. 1). "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Peter i. 21). "We speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth" (1 Cor. ii. 13).

In such passages as these the Scriptures unquestionably claim a Divine-human authorship: that God and man wrought together in their production in such a way as to fully entitle them to the name of "the Word of God." This union of the Divine and the human in the written Word furnishes no more occasion for surprise than the union of the divine and human in the living Word, "The Word that was God," and yet "was made flesh, and dwelt among us" (John i. 1, 14). The one is no more mysterious or incredible than the other.

1. Dr. A. A. Hodge gives an admirable summary of the truth in this matter in these words:

"God's agency in bringing the Scriptures into existence was four-fold, viz. : (1,) *By Providence*. God from the first designed and adapted every human writer employed in the genesis of Scripture. Paul, John, Peter, David, Isaiah, have been made precisely what they were, and placed and conditioned precisely as they were, and then moved to write, and directed in writing precisely what they wrote. The revelation was in large measure through a historical series of events, led along by a providential guidance largely natural, but surcharged, as a cloud with electricity, with supernatural elements all along its line. . . . (2,) *Spiritual Illumination*. Spiritual illumination by the Holy Ghost, a personal religious experience, was as necessary in the case of such writers as David, John, and Paul, as æsthetic taste and genius are in the case of a poet or artist. The spiritual intuition of John, the spiritualized understanding of Paul, the personal religious experience of David, have, by the superadded gift of inspiration, been rendered permanently typical and normal in the church in all ages. . . . (3,) *Revelation*. Revelation gives additional light which nature does not supply. In every instance where supernatural knowledge of God, his attributes, his purposes, of the secrets of his grace, or of the future of the church in the world, of the life of body or soul after death, came to be needed by a sacred writer, God immediately gave it to him by revelation. . . . (4,) *Inspiration*. This was the absolutely constant attribute of every portion and of every element of the Scriptures, and that attribute which renders them infallible in every utterance. . . . Inspiration is that influence of the immanent Holy Ghost which accompanies every thought and feeling and impulse and action of the sacred writer involved in the function of writing the Word, and which guided him in the selection and utterance of truth—*i. e.*, in its conception and in its verbal expression—so that the very mind of God was expressed with infallible accuracy." (*Popular Lectures on Theological Themes*, pp. 85-87.)

2. The inspiration which the Scriptures claim is *plenary, i. e.*, full, complete. By this is meant, (1,) That "it is not confined to moral and religious truths, but extends to the statements of facts, whether scientific, historical, or geographical. It is not confined to those facts the importance of which is obvious, or which are in-

volved in matters of doctrine. It extends to everything which any sacred writer asserts to be true. . . . As the life of the body belongs as much to the feet as to the head, so the Spirit of God pervades the whole Scripture, and is not more in one part than in another. Some members of the body are more important than others; and some books of the Bible could be far better spared than others. There may be as great a difference between St. John's Gospel and the books of Chronicles as between a man's brain and hair; nevertheless, the life of the body is as truly in the hair as in the brain." (*Hodge's Theology*, Vol. I., pp. 163, 164.) This truth has been aptly expressed by saying that the Scriptures *are* the Word of God; not simply, *contain* the Word of God. (2,) That inspiration extends to the very words of Scripture; that the inspiration is *verbal*, not in any such sense as would make the sacred writers mere amanuenses, but verbal in such a sense as is fairly implied in Paul's words, "Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth" (1 Cor. ii. 13). Men think in words, and the more definitely they think, the more are their thoughts immediately associated with an exactly appropriate verbal expression. Infallibility of thought cannot be secured or preserved independently of an infallible verbal rendering.

II. To this doctrine of the plenary inspiration of Scripture several objections have been urged.

1. It has been thought to be irreconcilable with the marked differences in style of thought and expression which characterize the writings of different sacred writers. Inspiration, in the economy of grace, is the special work of the Holy Spirit. That he should by inspiration secure an errorless record of the truth, through the instrumentality of Moses, or Paul, or Isaiah, without interfering with their own proper spontaneity, so that in their style of thought and expression there should be as characteristic differences as in the writings of Thucydides and Homer and Aristotle, should cause us no surprise. The Spirit, in his regeneration and sanctification of a human soul, does not destroy man's spontaneity, nor obliterate his sinless peculiarities. Peter and John had peculiarities of disposition and temper before their regenera-

tion, and they retained those peculiarities as long as they lived on earth; and, I doubt not, will retain them evermore: that in heaven, after the resurrection of the body has made the work of redemption complete, Peter will be Peter still, and John will be John.

2. Inspiration, according to the teaching of Scripture (*e. g.*, Luke i. 1-4), does not supersede the use of such means of information as, in God's providence, were within the writers' reach. In inspiration, as in regeneration and sanctification, the law obtains: "Work, for it is God that worketh in you." Throughout the greater part of the Pentateuch, Moses records what took place under his own eyes, and what he must have known from personal observation. In the book of Genesis, which records what occurred before his day, he may have made use of traditions current among his people, possibly of historical documents which had been handed down from former generations. All that is meant in affirming the plenary inspiration of the Pentateuch is, that Moses, in making use of such information, was guided by God the Spirit in the selection of the materials used, separating infallibly between the appropriate and the inappropriate, the true and the false. Nothing short of this would make his writings an infallible record of truth.

3. When inspiration is affirmed of the Scriptures, it is of the autographs of the sacred writers alone that it is affirmed, and not of the Septuagint, or the Vulgate, or the authorized English version, or any other version that ever has been or ever will be made. These original autographs, in so far as we know, have all been lost, and to-day we have nothing better than copies, some of them very ancient, and translations into languages other than those in which they were originally written, some of them also very ancient. That errors in transcription have been made is admitted by all. The "various readings," as they are called, are proof of this. That mistakes in translation have been made, in all the versions of the Bible in common use, no one acquainted with the facts in the case will deny. The recovery of the original text, *i. e.*, an exact copy of the autograph of the sacred writers, furnishes abundant scope for the employment of the best critical talent of the church, and the correction of errors in translation a working-

field for the best scholarship of the church in determining, exactly, what the Word of God is; but this once determined, there is for the christian an end of controversy. God has spoken, it is for man to believe and obey.

THE BIBLE OF MODERN SCIENTIFIC THEOLOGY.

The doctrine of the plenary inspiration of Scripture, especially as it applies to the earlier portions of the book of Genesis, is called in question in our day, on the ground that it is irreconcilable with the results of modern scientific discovery; and certain christian writers, in view of these "oppositions of science falsely so called," as we regard them, seem ready so to modify the doctrine that the inspiration of Scripture is no longer *plenary*, in any proper sense of that term.

Professor Drummond, the author of "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," in the *Popular Science Monthly* for April, 1886, writes:

"If the student of science will now apply to theology for its Bible, two very different books will be laid before him. The one is the Bible accepted by our forefathers; the other is *the Bible of modern theology*. The books, the chapters, the verses, and the words are the same in each, yet in the meaning, the interpretation, and the way they are looked at, they are two entirely distinct Bibles. The distinction between them is one which science will appreciate the moment it is stated. In point of fact, the one is constructed, like the world, according to the old cosmogonies; the other is an evolution. The one represents revelation as having been produced on the creative hypothesis, the Divine-fiat hypothesis, the ready-made hypothesis; the other on the slow growth or evolution theory. This latter—the Bible of development—is *the Bible of modern scientific theology*. It is not less authoritative than the first, but it is differently authoritative; not less inspired, but differently inspired. . . . The Bible is not an oracle which has been erected; it has grown. Hence it is no longer a mere word-book, nor a compendium of doctrine, but a nursery of growing truth. . . . The Bible is absolutely free from natural science. There is there history, poetry, moral philosophy, theology, lives and letters, mystical, devotional, and didactic pieces, but science there is none. Natural objects are, of course, repeatedly referred to, and with unsurpassed sympathy and accuracy of observation; but neither in the intention of any of the innumerable authors, nor in the execution of their work, is there any trace of scientific teaching." (P. 107.)

In an article on "The Reformation Theology in the Light of Modern Knowledge," published in *The Presbyterian Review* for April, 1887, Professor J. S. Candlish gives expression to views respecting the inspiration of Scripture, not as pronounced as those

of Professor Drummond, quoted above, but yet having the same trend. He writes:

"Some of the earlier records of the Bible are not properly historical, nor meant to be taken as literally true, but analogous to the myths of other nations, though differing from them in their pure theistic and moral character in a way quite worthy of Divine guidance and inspiration. . . . What inspiration gave to the writers of the sacred books may not have been minute or literal exactness on points not essential for their main purpose, but perfect truth and soundness in the great religious lessons that they teach, and in the historical events in which God's revelation of himself is conveyed." (P. 230.)

"God's calls and commands to the patriarchs may possibly not have been single, instantaneous utterances, as the first reading of the narrative might suggest; it is enough to indicate their substantial truth that, in some way or other, God's will was unmistakably conveyed to the recipient of his revelation. Such theological notions as Divine legislation, covenants, judgments, and the like, may be not the less real and important, though they may not be regarded as denoting express and definite transactions, occurring at particular epochs, but rather certain relations or states brought about, or brought into consciousness, by slow and gradual processes." (P. 232.)

"The successive discoveries by which the present wonderful advance of science has been attained have seemed, when first made, in many cases, to conflict with the doctrines of theology or the teachings of Scripture; and have therefore been sometimes keenly and obstinately opposed, as is seen in the persecution of Galileo by the Inquisition, and in the alarm aroused, even among Protestant theologians, by the discoveries of geology, and by Darwin's theory of the origin of species. But clearly no such opposition could arrest the progress of science, or prevent the acceptance by all intelligent men of the facts and laws based on sufficient evidence. These must be accepted whatever may become of theological doctrines, and if any theology comes in collision with ascertained facts, so much the worse for the theology. In most of these cases, however, it came to be seen that what science controverted was some of these theories founded on a too literal interpretation of Scripture, or pressing its statements too far. The general principle on which we must ultimately fall back in all cases is, that the Bible contains a revelation of religious truth, and not of science at all, and in all its references to the physical world speaks according to the appearances of things and the current ideas of the times." (P. 231.)

"The idea of evolution has in modern thought come to supersede that of creation in many cases; but if the power at work in it is believed to be that of a supreme, wise, and beneficent Mind, evolution is, for all practical purposes, the same to the theologian as creation. We are taught in Scripture to recognize God as the Creator of our bodies, though his direct agency in giving us being is at least as far back as Adam; and if science shows that it must be put still further back, it makes no essential difference; it is still true that God is our maker, and we are the sheep of his pasture and the people of his hand. The notion of a gradual development instead of a sudden, abrupt act, gives a different form to some doctrines, but does not alter their essential meaning." (P. 232.)

I have quoted these articles thus fully, that the reader may have, in the very words of its advocates, the doctrine of inspiration which some are seeking to substitute for that of the plenary inspiration of Scripture as hitherto held by the church. The two doctrines are certainly very unlike, and they have their outcome, as Professor Drummond has well said, "in two very different books," and he has appropriately designated these books as "the Bible accepted by our forefathers," and "the Bible of modern scientific theology." The demand for the substitution of this new doctrine of inspiration in the place of the old is made, mainly, on the ground that modern science requires it. Does science, indeed, make this demand?

I. Is it true that "the idea of evolution has in modern thought come to supersede that of creation, in many cases," and more especially the idea of evolution as embodied in Darwin's theory of the origin of species? Prof. Candlish takes it for granted that it has.

On the other hand, "At the late ter-centenary of the University of Edinburgh, in the presence of the assembled magnates of Europe, Prof. Virchow declared, with great emphasis, that evolution has no scientific basis," (*Christian Thought*, July, 1884, p. 74.) A year later, Principal Dawson, who was called to preside at the annual meeting of the British Scientific Association, in 1886, wrote: "The doctrine of evolution as held by a prominent school of German and English biologists, I regard as equally at variance with science, revelation and common sense, and destitute of any foundation in fact. It belongs, in truth, to the region of those illogical paradoxes and loose speculations which have ever haunted the progress of knowledge, and have been dispelled only by increasing light. For this reason, I have always refused to recognize the dreams of materialistic evolution as of any scientific significance, or indeed as belonging to science at all," (*Philadelphia Presbyterian*, July 11th, 1885.) And later still, I find the following testimony in *Christian Thought*, April, 1887: "That British thought, says the *Christian Commonwealth*, London, is arriving at a transition period has just been powerfully demonstrated by a high authority. Savants of different schools will acknowledge the weight attaching to the opinions of such a thinker, lecturer, teacher

and writer as Henry Calderwood. This learned Edinburgh professor has, in a most interesting essay in a late number of the *New Princeton Review*, proclaimed his conviction that the reign of the evolution idea is near its close. Prof. Calderwood remarks of the whole sensational or experiential philosophy, that it gained largely in popularity because it has connected itself with the evolution theory. He adds, in a very striking sentence, that he is unable to regard it otherwise than as *a passing, though prominent feature of nineteenth century thought*. Such a deliverance as this from one of the very highest authorities on modern metaphysics is a sure sign that a fresh era of scientific sentiment is very near, and that evolutionism will presently be seen receding on an ebbing tide." In view of such declarations as these, one may reasonably be pardoned for refusing to surrender the old doctrine of plenary inspiration at the demand of evolution, at least until it shall be known more surely whether its "oppositions" are those of science, or of "science (*γνώσις*, knowledge) falsely so called."

II. Is it true, as Prof. Candlish affirms, that "if the power at work in it is believed to be that of a supreme, wise and beneficent mind, evolution is, for all practical purposes, the same to the theologian as creation"; that "though it gives a different form to some doctrines, it does not alter their essential meaning"?

1. This may be true, in so far as mere theism is concerned. But theology, the theology of Scripture, is something more than mere theism, and embraces other doctrines than those of the existence and nature of God the Creator. What is distinctively called christian theology—and without this, mere theism is of little practical value to man—is derived immediately from the teachings of Scripture. Indeed, no class of writers insist more frequently than that to which Profs. Drummond and Candlish belong, that it was for the very purpose of teaching man christian theology, teaching him religion and not science, that the Scriptures were written. Is evolution, as taught by Darwin in his "Origin of Species," for all practical purposes, the same with creation to the christian theologian?

2. Can the account of the creation of man, "male and female," given us in Scripture be made to harmonize with Darwin's theory

without utterly destroying, not their historic character alone, but their veracity as well? In Gen. ii. 21, 22, we read: "And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept; and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh thereof. And the rib which the Lord God had taken from man made he a woman, and brought her unto the man." This is, confessedly, a literal translation of the record as it stands in the inspired text. In what Prof. Drummond calls "the Bible of development, the Bible of modern scientific theology," it will read: "And the Lord God, by a very gradual process, extending possibly over millions of years, evolved woman from 'an animal which seems to have been more like the larva of our existing ascidians' (sea-squirts) 'than any other known form.'" (See Darwin's *Descent of Man*, Vol. II., p. 372.) To justify this reading of the Bible of scientific theology, I will be told the Scriptures were not given us to teach science. How far, and in what sense this is true, we shall see hereafter, but in the present instance it has no relevancy. The statements are statements of facts, and Prof. Drummond admits that when the Scriptures refer to natural objects, they do so "with unsurpassed accuracy of observation."

3. According to Darwin's "Theory of the Origin of Species"—and it is evolution as embodied in that theory that Prof. Candlish specifies—what was the character and condition of primeval man? In the words of one of its advocates, "If there be any truth in science at all, there was a time when our ancestor—whom, for want of a better term we call primitive man—was removed from the brute only inasmuch as he had a more erect carriage, a little bigger brain, and more completely differentiated members. Of religion, morality, decency, pity, social law, patriotism, he understood no more than the ape, his brother. He was as much outside the pale of the moral law as the spider or the vulture. In his murders, his cannibalism, his bestialities, was no sin, because there was no knowledge. He was simply a brute, inclosing in himself potentialities of future development. The product of the law of evolution, he had in himself the power of evolution." (*Order of*

¹ *The Order of Creation* is a volume, recently published, containing the papers of the late Gladstone-Huxley controversy, together with others on the points in debate, by Max Müller, Reville, and Linton.

Creation, pp. 168-9.) Such is the latest full-length portrait of Adam Bar-Simia I have seen, drawn by the pencil of a friend who believed in him.

Will not this idea of the character of our first parent, if received as true, require a modification of certain doctrines we are accustomed to regard as fundamental, amounting to more than a mere "difference in form which does not alter their essential meaning"? Take the doctrine embodied in Ans. 12 of the Shorter Catechism, for example: "When God had created man, he entered into a covenant of life with him, upon condition of perfect obedience; forbidding him to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, upon pain of death." Was it with this creature, who "of religion, morality, decency, pity, social law, patriotism, understood no more than the ape, his brother," that God "entered into a covenant of life on condition of perfect obedience," and this, "not only for himself, but for his posterity"? And, was this the creature that in his covenant relations to his posterity was "the figure (τύπος, the type) of him that was to come?" (Rom. v. 14.) Or, take the doctrine embodied in Ans. 13 of the Shorter Catechism: "Our first parents, being left to the freedom of their own will, fell from the estate in which they were created, by sinning against God." *"Sinning against God!"* Why, to them, even in "their murders, their bestialities, their cannibalism, there was no sin, for there was no knowledge. They were as much outside the pale of the moral law as the spider or the vulture." *"Fell from the estate wherein they were created!"* How could they fall? Already at the lowest point at which humanity can exist, "simply brutes, inclosing in themselves potentialities of future development," there is no lower point to which they can descend and yet retain their humanity. Surely, if this Adam Bar-Simia is the Adam of the "Bible of development—the Bible of modern scientific theology," that Bible must teach doctrines on these points very different from those which, by common consent, are taught in the "Bible accepted by our fathers."

III. Prof. Drummond writes: The Bible "contains history, poetry, moral philosophy, theology, lives and letters, mythical, devotional and didactic pieces, but science there is none. Natural

objects are, of course, repeatedly referred to, and with unsurpassed sympathy and accuracy of observation; but neither in the intention of any of the innumerable authors, nor in the execution of their work, is there any direct trace of scientific teaching." And Prof. Candlish: "The Bible contains a revelation of religious truth, and not of science at all." And this statement, in substance, has been repeated time and again by writers of the school to which they belong. There is a sense in which this statement is unquestionably true; but, in the sense in which it must be understood in order to serve the purpose for which it is made, if I mistake not, it is utterly devoid of truth. It belongs to the category of those equivocal statements in which error finds its safest lurking place. For this reason I will ask the reader's attention to a more careful examination of it than would otherwise be necessary.

1. God's great purpose in the Scriptures is to teach man the true religion. In the words of the Shorter Catechism: "The Scriptures principally teach what man is to believe concerning God, and what duty God requires of man." (Answer 3.) The true religion is practical in its nature. The lessons contained in the Bible are intended to direct and control man's life and conduct. Practical truths are always best taught by illustration and example. For this reason, the Bible consists largely of biographies of saints and sinners, and the history of the execution of God's scheme of redemption for sin-ruined man, and especially of the life and teaching of Christ Jesus, "God manifest in the flesh." Hence it comes that the Bible, on the one hand, and geography, history, chronology, and science, physical and metaphysical, on the other, must often cover the same ground and deal with the same facts.

As an instance in point, take the cosmogony contained in the first chapter of Genesis. The statements there made are statements fundamental in religion, and, in the light of the subsequent history of our race, we can see how all-important these statements are. From the very beginning of human history, practical atheism among philosophers and idolatry among the ignorant masses have been the two forms of error which have taken the place of the true religion most widely in the minds and hearts of men. The eternity of matter, that the heaven and the earth had no beginning, is a

necessary postulate of philosophical atheism, and the declaration, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth" (Gen. i. 1), effectually and for ever sets aside such atheism as a possible faith for one who receives the Bible as true. Idolatry, in its earliest and purest form, consisted in the worship of the heavenly bodies, the sun and the moon. In the declaration, "God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night; he made the stars also" (Gen. i. 16), the irrational character of such worship is clearly set forth. Why should man worship the sun and the moon, if they be but creatures of God like himself? Idolatry in its grosser forms has usually consisted in the worship of beasts of the earth, and even creeping things, or their images. When, in Gen. i. 25, 26, we are told that God created "the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and everything that creepeth upon the earth after his kind"; and furthermore, that, having made man, "he gave him dominion over them" all, "the axe is laid at the root" of idolatry in its grosser forms. God made man to have dominion over the creatures of his hand, and not they over him. Thus it will be seen that this cosmogony is not simply a curious piece of information to satisfy the curiosity of the multitude, or please the fancy of the poet, like the cosmogonies of the Greeks and Egyptians, but a most important part of a revelation of the true religion. In the words of Matthew Henry, in Gen. i. 1 "we find, to our comfort, the first article of our creed, that *God, the Father Almighty, is the maker of heaven and earth*, and as such we *believe in him*."

That cosmogony is a proper subject of investigation to the scientific geologist no reasonable man will deny. It is impossible that he should pursue his science beyond the narrow limits of its practical application to agriculture and mining, without questions respecting the origin of the present order of things presenting themselves; and, in the careful study of the agencies now at work in effecting changes in that order, he has the means at command of pushing his investigations in a legitimate way back into the history of the long past. Here, then, is a field in which the Scriptures and science must cover the same ground, and the scientist and the divine must meet in the study of the same facts and phenomena.

2. The scientist and divine must often study the same facts and phenomena; but they differ in this study, both in the object they have in view and in the methods and instruments they employ. (1.) The scientist contemplates man simply as a rational being having a life to live in the world, and he seeks to ascertain general laws, and to classify facts, with a view of satisfying man's natural and laudable curiosity, or of subjecting nature to his service in providing for the daily recurring wants of the body. The divine contemplates man as an immortal creature, and he pursues his studies with the especial purpose of solving the great questions of religion, questions respecting man's duties to his fellow-man and his God, and his relations to the world to come. (2.) In the study of the scientist, observation and experiment are the means by which he seeks to ascertain the truth he is in quest of. In the case of the divine, his appeal is to the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, which he receives as the word of God, "the only rule of faith and obedience," and literary criticism and exegesis are the means he depends on in prosecuting his research. To say of the divine, as has sometimes been done, when, by a careful and critical study of the original Hebrew of the first chapter of Genesis, he seeks to settle a true cosmogony so far as it is there revealed, he is trenching upon the territory which belongs to the scientist; and of his conclusions, when he has reached them, that they are scientific deliverances, betrays great confusion of thought on the part of him who brings such charges.

Is the question asked, Is there any scientific treatment of facts in the Bible; scientific in the purpose and means of treatment? We must answer, No. In this sense the statement "the Bible is absolutely free from natural science," is true. But is the question asked, Do the Bible and science often deal with the same facts, each for its own purpose and in its own way? The answer must be, Yes. Prof. Drummond himself writes: "In the Bible natural objects are repeatedly referred to, and with unsurpassed sympathy and accuracy of observation." Yet it is in this last sense the statement under consideration must be understood, a sense in which it is not true, if it is to serve the purpose for which it is made. Recurring to the case already partially examined, the case of the

creation of woman, as given us in Gen. ii. 21-25, I remark, the statement here given is plainly to be considered a statement of fact. Neither in form nor in substance has it any resemblance to a myth. The Apostle Paul evidently understood it as a statement of fact when he wrote: "The man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man; neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man." (1 Cor. xi. 8, 9.) And so also does our Lord, when teaching that most important lesson of christian morals, the sacredness of the marriage relation, and with the evident intention of throwing the sanction of Jehovah around the family, the corner-stone of christian civilization, as all history testifies, he says: "Have ye not read that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female; and said, For this reason shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh" (Matt. xix. 4, 5), thus quoting the very words of Gen. ii. 24. When Darwin tells me that woman is the evolute of a sea-squirt, he gives what purports to be a statement of fact. And these two statements of Moses and Darwin are irreconcilable the one with the other, and the proposition, "the Bible is absolutely free from natural science," "the Bible contains a revelation of religious truth and not of science at all," in the only sense in which it is true, does not touch the difficulty.

IV. Prof. Candlish writes: The Bible, "in all its references to the physical world, speaks according to the appearances of things and the current ideas of the times." Here, as in the statement just considered, there is a mixture of truth and error, and we must carefully distinguish the one from the other if we would not be led astray.

In the controversy between Galileo and his judges of the Index, often very unfairly represented as a controversy between science and revelation, in reality a controversy between the old Aristotelian philosophy and the new, Galileo defended himself on the ground that the Scriptures are written in the language of common life and not that of science, and, when interpreted as so written, they are not in conflict with the Copernican doctrine of the solar system which he advocated. This principle is of wider

application than at first sight appears; and the fact that it did not at once secure universal acceptance can be explained only by taking into account the influence of prejudice, prejudice of long standing, and having the countenance of great names. In the course of time, however, it has come to be universally accepted, and, fairly applied, it answers many of the objections which scientists, in our day, are accustomed to urge against the doctrine of the plenary inspiration of Scripture.

1. The language of common life, as contradistinguished from that of science, is marked by two particulars, viz.:

(1,) It is phenomenal; it speaks of things as they are made known to us through the senses. In the language of common life the sun is said to rise and set, although we know that its motion in the heavens is apparent, and not real; and the dew is said to fall, although we know that the dew-drop is formed by the condensation of the moisture of the air at the very point at which we find it. When the sacred writers tell us, "And as Jacob passed over Penuel the sun rose upon him" (Gen. xxxii. 31), and "when the dew fell upon the camp in the night the manna fell upon it" (Numb. xi. 9), they are simply using the language of common life.

(2,) It uses words and expressions in the current sense of the time at which it was written, without any reference to their etymology, and without any endorsement of erroneous beliefs in which their etymology shows them to have originated. We are accustomed to speak, and so are the sacred writers, of certain persons as lunatics (*σηληξιμενους*) without a thought of thereby endorsing the exploded error that madness in man must be traced to the disturbing influence of the moon. The kind of movement common to quadrupeds, as distinguished from that of man, we are accustomed to speak of as "going upon all fours," and Moses, using the language of common life, writes: "All fowls that creep, *going upon all four*, shall be an abomination unto you." (Lev. xi. 20.) From verse 22, it is evident that among the "fowls that creep" locusts were included. From this language to infer that Moses was ignorant of the fact that locusts have six legs, or to impugn the verbal inspiration of Scripture, is to disregard the settled truth that the Scriptures are written in the language of common life.

The authorized English version reads: "All fowls that creep, going upon all four." From this it is evident that at the time our English version was made the word "fowl" (from the A. S. *fleogan*, to fly,) was used in a much wider sense than it is in our day, the wider sense of "flying creature." The New Version substitutes the "flying creature" for "fowl" in this passage. How ridiculous it would be for a critic, restricting the term fowl, as we now do, to the gallinæ, to conclude, on the authority of their translation of Lev. xi. 20, that the venerable authors of our English version believed that hens had four legs.

2. Respecting the language of common life, I remark :

(1,) It is the language used by scholars of the highest standing in writing history, biography, poetry, and by learned statesmen in writing the laws of the land, where the greatest accuracy is demanded.

(2,) It is the only language intelligible to the great mass of the people. The language of science is intelligible to scientists alone, and often that peculiar to one department of science is unintelligible to the scientist devoted to the study of a different department, *e. g.*, the language of chemistry to the mathematician.

(3,) The language of science almost always embodies more or less of current theories, and so will vary as current theories vary. The ferric oxide of the chemistry of to-day was called dephlogisticated iron eighty years ago. According to the chemistry of that day, ferric oxide was the simple substance, and iron the compound, the last-mentioned being transmuted into the first-mentioned by the loss of its phlogiston. So variable is the language of science, of chemistry for example, that could the once celebrated chemist Stahl rise from his grave and enter the lecture-room of some professor of chemistry of to-day, he would find himself "a barbarian to the speaker, and the speaker a barbarian to him."

(4,) The language of common life, for the purpose for which it is ordinarily used, and for the purpose for which it is used in Scripture, is as accurate as the language of science. What is desired is, by means of language, to convey a truth respecting things as they present themselves to us in the ordinary business of life; this, and nothing more. And this is just what the language of

common life does. In view of such facts as these, it must be admitted by every thoughtful person that the Scriptures, intended as they are for the instruction of "the common people," ought to be written in the language of common life; and the fact that they are so written, instead of furnishing ground for questioning the divine element in their authorship, furnishes a strong argument in support of their inspiration of God, and that their inspiration extends to the very words in which they are written.

3. The Bible, "in all its references to the physical world, speaks according to . . . the current ideas of the times," writes Prof. Candlish. If by the current ideas of the times is meant the scientific ideas current at the times, I remark, this is just what the Scriptures do not do. Translators have sometimes done this: as where the Hebrew רָקִיעַ (expanse) Gen. i. 6, is in the Vulgate translated *firmamentum*, and unfortunately in our English version the Vulgate, and not the inspired Hebrew text, has been followed; and so the exploded idea of the ancient astronomers that the sun, moon, and stars were fixed in crystal spheres, has been foisted into the Scriptures. In the inspired Scripture this is never done. God has adapted his revelation to the necessities of the case in a manner far better than this, by "leading inspired men to use such language that, without revealing scientific facts in advance, it might accurately accommodate itself to them when discovered. The language of Scripture is so elastic and flexible as to contract itself to the narrowness of ignorance, and yet expand itself to the dimensions of knowledge, like the rubber bandages so invaluable in modern surgery, which stretch about an inflamed and swollen limb, yet shrink as the swelling abates. It uses terms and phrases which, without suggesting puzzling enigmas, contain in themselves ample space for all the demands of growing human knowledge; it selects from imperfect human language terms which may hold hidden truths till ages to come shall disclose their hidden meaning." (*Pierson's Many Infallible Proofs*, p. 116.) As instances in point, take Eccl. i. 7.: "All the rivers run into the sea, yet the sea is not full; unto the place from whence the rivers come, thither they return again"; and Job, xxvi. 7, 8: "He stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the

earth upon nothing. He bindeth up the waters in his thick clouds; and the cloud is not rent under them."

V. In considering the demands for a modification of the views of inspiration long entertained by christian theologians, we must not forget that many of these demands made in the name of science, are not demands of science at all, but of mere hypotheses adopted by certain scientists. Prof. Huxley defines science in the words: "Every science must consist of precise knowledge, and that knowledge must be coördinated into general propositions, or it is not science." (*Humboldt Library*, No. 21, p. 472.) True science, science in the sense defined above, is fixed and certain, but hypotheses are ever changing; and hence, it is a matter of prime importance that the distinction between the two should be kept in mind, if we would reason safely on questions such as those we are considering. When Prof. Huxley writes in his late controversy with Gladstone, "I am not aware that any competent judge would hesitate to admit that the organization of these animals (whales and porpoises) show the most obvious signs of their descent from terrestrial quadrupeds," (*Order of Creation*, p. 54,) he evidently assumes the truth of the hypothesis of genetic evolution, and of that hypothesis in its most objectionable form, viz., that evolution is as often downward as upward—is a degeneracy as often as an advance. In this form the hypothesis is irreconcilably at variance with the plainest testimony of the fossiliferous rock-strata of the earth; and the objection to the Mosaic order of creation based upon it is not an objection of science, according to Huxley's own definition of that term. It is an objection founded upon a mere hypothesis, and an hypothesis, I will venture to predict, Huxley himself will reject before ten years have passed.

If the reader will take with him the two propositions, the truth of which no thoughtful man can question, (1,) That the Scriptures are written in the language of common life, and (2,) That hypothesis is not science, and should never be regarded as such, he will find in the study of Scripture no necessity to modify "the church doctrine," as Dr. Hodge calls it, of their plenary inspiration, and consequently no need of such modifications of "the Reformation theology," as Prof. Candlish proposes.

VI. Prof. Candlish, in view of what he conceives to be a possible emergency, writes: "Facts and laws based upon sufficient evidence must be accepted whatever may become of theological doctrines; and if any theology comes in collision with ascertained facts, so much the worse for the theology." To this, it is sufficient to answer that true theology, the theology of the Bible, never can come in conflict with ascertained facts if the Bible be the word of God. But interpreting this declaration in the light of the context, and the conclusions reached in the argument in the course of which it is made—the sense in which such language is often used by "modern scientific theologians,"—it would seem to mean that in any case where there was a conflict between the doctrine of Scripture and the commonly accepted doctrine of science, the doctrine of Scripture must "go to the wall." From this conclusion I, for one, entirely dissent.

I receive the Scriptures as the word of God, and therefore, beyond all question, as true, on their own appropriate evidence. In the words of Gladstone, "I have an unshaken belief in divine revelation, not resting on assumption, but made obligatory upon me by reason." (*Order of Creation*, p. 9.) Our Lord says, "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God or whether I speak of myself." (John vii. 17.) Besides proof from other sources, nearly sixty years ago I took the Lord at his word as above recorded, and began the application of this text; and to-day, if there is anything I feel certain of, anything I *know*, it is that the Bible is the word of God, and therefore "the truth." About the same time I commenced the study of natural science, and have kept it up more or less diligently through all these years, and I know that, in more instances than one, what were regarded as settled truths of science, and taught as such in my youth, are now just as generally regarded as exploded errors, *e. g.*, the infinite divisibility of matter, and that oxygen is the sole acidifier; indeed, oxygen took the name it still bears, as the etymology of the name declares, from this general belief.

Besides this, all the conclusions of the scientist are based upon observation and experiment. As already remarked, these are the instruments by which he prosecutes his researches. Now (1,) ob-

servation may mislead, the apparent being mistaken for the real, as in the Ptolemaic astronomy which dominated scientific thought for many centuries. Even to-day we have a colored minister in Richmond, Va., a man of no mean ability, too, who insists upon it, in public and in private, "that the sun do move." (2.) In the case of what are seemingly the most carefully conducted experiments, there may be some unknown or unnoticed element not taken into account, the neglect of which may vitiate all our conclusions. This has been illustrated, recently, in the elaborate experiments of Dr. Bastian, by which the spontaneous generation of life was, for a time, thought to be established. When Prof. Tyndall repeated these experiments, simply supplying an oversight of Dr. Bastian, the result was altogether different, and the conclusion he came to he states in these words: "No shred of trustworthy experimental testimony exists to prove that life, in our day, ever appears independently of antecedent life."

As the result of his experience extending through a long life devoted to the study of natural science, Professor Huxley writes: "I do not believe in the Ptolemaic astronomy, or the catastrophic geology of my youth, although these, in their day, claimed—and to my mind rightly claimed—the name of science. If nothing is to be called science but that which is exactly true from beginning to end, I am afraid there is very little science in the world outside mathematics. Among the physical sciences, I do not know that any could claim more than that each is true within certain limits so narrow that, for the present at any rate, they may be neglected." (*Order of Creation*, p. 159.) For these reasons, where there is a conflict between a truth or doctrine clearly taught in Scripture, and the generally accepted conclusions of science, sound logic requires that we accept the former, and reject the latter. God cannot err; science may err, in the present, as it often has in the past.

GEO. D. ARMSTRONG.

IV. THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

WHEN the church received its great enlargement in the family of Jacob, we find that it was divided into twelve tribes, besides the priestly sons of Levi. These tribes had their separate inheritance and local officers; and their rival interests and jealousies led to strife and sometimes to bloodshed. For political reasons, they finally separated into two nationalities, which were not only engaged in almost perpetual warfare with each other, but also had an entirely distinct worship. Later on, in the interval between the close of the Old Testament canon and the coming of Christ, rival sects arose, Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes, to one or the other of which every worshiper of Jehovah attached himself. So it was when our Saviour was upon the earth.

When Pentecost ushered in the peculiarly Christian period of the church, it was attended by the gift of tongues. This seemed to indicate that the Babel reign of confusion and division was now over, and that the days had come when the multitude of them that believed would be of one heart and soul. There had been strife among the apostles of the Lord, during the period of his presence with them, as to who should be the greatest. Some had then rebuked those who cast out devils in Christ's name because not of their own following. So we find very early that there was a diversity of opinion and practice which separated the very apostles. Paul rebuked Peter to his face, and the same apostle separated himself from Barnabas on a question of expediency. The church itself was divided into two grand sections, the Judaizers and the followers of Paul. The synod, which met at Jerusalem to consider this question, failed to settle it. The decision was a compromise, and was doubtless unsatisfactory to both the severely logical and the passionate minds of each extreme.

Beginning with the apostolic age, we find that contentions, divisions, heresies, sects, schisms mark the history of the church, in every period at all distinguished for its activity or progress. During the sleep of the middle ages, the peace of the church

was, comparatively, but little disturbed. There were the faithful few, "the Church in the Wilderness," the Waldenses of Piedmont; and in 1054, after long contention, lasting several centuries, the Catholic Church was disrupted, and its fragments were known as the Eastern or Greek Church and the Western or Latin Church. The Greek communion has, since its separate existence, been in a state of hibernation; enjoying the unity which comes from the torpor of ignorance and lack of thought. But even this church has its dissenters, in the Armenians, Nestorians, Jacobites, Copts and Abyssinians. Moreover, the orthodox have found it necessary to divide themselves into the six national churches of Russia, Servia, Roumania, Bulgaria, Greece, and Montenegro, which have no organic connection with each other.

The Western, Latin, Roman Church has always had a life more or less active, and consequently has been correspondingly distracted with dissensions. There were the contentions of the Realists and Nominalists, of the Guelphs and Ghibellines, of the rival popes at Avignon and Rome in the fourteenth century, and almost continual trouble with dissenters and heretics, such as the Albigenses, the followers of Wickliffe, John Huss and Jerome of Prague. The most marked of these was the convulsion of the sixteenth century, which shook this church from centre to circumference, resulting in the separation of the great majority of the Teutonic races from the papal communion and the establishment of the Protestant Church. But Rome's troubles have not ceased since it has been freed from this active, progressive and aggressive element. The Jesuits and Jansenists, the Gallicans and Ultramontanes, the Holland church, the believers in and the deniers of the temporal power, the Old and the New Catholics, all attest that the outward unity of the papacy but thinly veils a turbulent life within.

The Protestant Church has wonderfully exemplified the differentiating influence of active, independent thought. Leaving the old harbor with the pennant flying at the masthead, on which was written in capitals, *The Right of Private Judgment*, instead of a single boat, we find a numerous fleet of vessels, each with a different flag to distinguish it from its neighbors. There are two

grand divisions of the Protestant host: the Lutherans and the Reformed. The Lutherans, or as they sometimes call themselves, "Evangelicals," especially in their earlier days, have had a stormy life. There were the antinomian, the synergistic, the justification, the consubstantiation, the Form of Concord controversies; and there is now a well-defined division between the high-church sacramentarian party and the low-church evangelicals. In addition to these causes of division, there are the differences of nationality and race, which have led to distinct churches in every separate country; while in Prussia and in other instances the union of the Lutherans and the Reformed into one state church has left a residuum of strict followers of Luther, who refuse to submit to the amalgamation, and are known as dissenters.

But the disintegrating process has reached its maximum in the Reformed branch of the Protestant Church. Here the divisions are so numerous and so complicated as to defy a completely accurate classification. It will answer our purpose to allude to a few of the more important. There is a division by nationality. The cases are rare where church lines, except so far as missionary enterprises are concerned, overlap state or national limits. For example, there is a separate Presbyterian church for England, for Ireland, and for Scotland. The most interesting and important basis of division is upon the system of grace in theology, according to which there are Calvinists and Arminians. The form of government classifies them into Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Episcopalians. The mode of administering baptism arranges them into Baptists and Pædo-baptists. Each one of these is still further subdivided. For instance, the Presbyterians of this country have more than half a dozen distinct organizations. The minor sects are almost numberless; and it is doubtful whether an exhaustively complete list of them has ever been made.

We are struck with the fact, that these divisions multiply as the centuries roll around; that they are more numerous in the most active and intelligent periods of the church's history; and that many of them are caused and perpetuated by mere trifles. The *Filioque* controversy and schism strikingly exemplifies the last statement.

THESE DIVISIONS MAR THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH,

Chiefly, it would seem, in three ways: I. By the *strifes* which they engender. This is seen in the civil wars between the tribes in Old Testament times, beginning with the slaughter of the Benjamites and continuing to the days when Judah vexed Ephraim and Ephraim envied Judah. It is seen in the heated contentions that marked the early centuries of the Christian era. It is shown in the mutual excommunications hurled against each other by the rival bishops of Rome and Constantinople. It is read on the bloody pages which record the history of the Albigenses and the Vaudois. The Thirty Years' War of Germany is a record of it. The Roman Inquisition tells its most sickening story; while the heather hills of Scotland and the fires of Smithfield bear sad witness to its dreadful facts. Since christians have ceased to use carnal weapons in their conflicts, they have employed as the instruments of their strife, not only argument, but too frequently satire, irony and even calunmy. It is happily true that persecution of one body of christians by another has almost entirely ceased within the limits of Christendom. Moreover, wordy warfare, disputes, debates, have decreased and are apparently destined to become mere memories in the church. It is no longer the staple preaching to denounce the creeds of others, and it has become a rare thing that we hear a controversial sermon. The religious press, to a large degree, reflects this more friendly spirit, and devotes itself more and more to the positive and the practical. In the new and growing sections of our own country, this evil attendant of the division of the church is now probably seen at its worst. When a new town is started, every denomination feels called upon to enter the field. The result frequently is a number of starveling, contentious organizations, who fight one another as lustily as they do the powers of evil. There is, however, by no means so much of strife, even under these conditions, as there formerly was. The church is learning that there may be and ought to be active rivalry without the jealous spirit of opposition.

II. The divisions in the church are a *stumbling block to outsiders* and a *grief to many believers*. Bacon, in his essay on *Unity in Religion*, expresses the judgment that "it is certain, that

heresies and schisms are of all others the greatest scandals; yea, more than corruption of manners." Neither the grammar nor the sentiment of this quotation is endorsed. It is probably true, however, that the two facts mentioned, the divisions of the church and the inconsistencies of christians, constitute the greatest barriers to the complete triumph of the church in gospel lands. The unholy lives of many professors is, however, a far greater hindrance to the success of the gospel now than the divisions in the church are. It may have been quite different in Bacon's day. Every pastor who is aggressive and personal in his work has doubtless sometimes heard the objection urged and the plea made by the unconverted, that the contentions of the churches constitute a barrier to their acceptance of christianity. With some this is doubtless a mere pretext, but with others it is a serious difficulty. It seems to them incredible that a divine organization, blessed with the perpetual indwelling of the Holy Spirit, God's own kingdom upon the earth, could become rent into numberless factions, all different and many of them hostile and discordant.

This evil is great in christian lands, but it is much worse among the heathen. Every intelligent man in Bible countries can see many things which offset these divisions. Moreover, here the whole tone of society is christian, and every presumption is in its favor. But it is the reverse in China and India and Japan. How strange the differences of christians must seem to them! How ridiculous it must appear to find churches founded upon a peculiar mode of administering a rite, the particular kind of psalmody to be employed, the section of the same country from which its missionaries hail! It would seem that this must be a serious drawback to the thoughtful, critical heathen.

These divisions are a grief to many earnest lovers of our Lord. With some it is, as to outsiders, a trial to their faith. Satan uses it to torment their souls with questioning doubts. With others, it is a temptation to bigotry and intolerance. Like John, they are prone to say, "Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followeth not us; and we forbade him because he followeth not us." Such christians are greatly injured by the cultivation of this spirit of uncharitableness. It is worse for them than it is for

their brethren whom they thus unchurch and dechristianize. With still other believers, these divisions are a great sorrow. They mourn over the breaches of Zion, and sigh as they think of the distractions of the Lord's people. They long and labor for the outward as well as the inward unity of the church.

III. Perhaps the most serious evil, growing out of the divisions in the church, is the *waste of force* caused by them. It is difficult to estimate this. Let us look at the pastorate in the small towns. The average number of members in each of the Southern Presbyterian churches is less than sixty-five. We may presume, then, that the small towns of three thousand inhabitants and under will not average over one hundred members each. In such places, from four to eight separate churches are found, usually each with its own pastor. It is within bounds to say that an average minister is amply adequate to supply the religious wants of these small communities. A church of five hundred members is, in some respects, more easily handled than one with a hundred or less. It usually furnishes better material for active, efficient officers, and the *esprit de corps* is superior. Suppose that, instead of weak churches, averaging less than a hundred, in these villages and towns, it was the rule that no second church of any denomination should be organized unless each will have a strength of at least two hundred; we can see at once that congregational expenses would be not more than half what they now are. This would save to the Southern Presbyterian Church, in pastors' salaries and other congregational expenses, possibly as much as three hundred thousand dollars a year: more than is given to all the committees of the church. If this amount could be saved and expended upon the missionary work of this church, it could easily plant missions in every opening that presents itself in our own country, and more than double its work among the heathen. It would be an equal saving to all other communions, whose cords could be lengthened and whose stakes greatly strengthened by the more judicious and economical expenditure of the Lord's money.

If these divisions did not exist, another large sum could be saved in the amounts expended upon our religious papers and other publications. There are said to be seven hundred religious peri-

odicals in this country. It may be safely said that one-fourth of these papers would then be unnecessary. The reduced number, with a larger subscription list, could furnish better reading at less cost. The same money would be far more efficient than now in our church schools and colleges. Church academies and high schools could be greatly multiplied, and would accomplish a work not second in importance to that of our colleges and universities. The expenses of the foreign field would be greatly curtailed, and the same money would probably go ten per cent. further than now.

It will doubtless be said that the union of the churches is impracticable, and that, therefore, it is useless to speak of what would be saved by it. This is not the point now before us. We are simply showing that the division of the churches involves a very heavy expense, that would otherwise be unnecessary.

This will suggest, however, the second observation, that

MANY OF THESE DIVISIONS IN THE CHURCH ARE UNAVOIDABLE.

Those who think that the various denominations should be merged into one belong to two quite distinct classes. There are those who contend that unity should be secured on the basis of some one of the existing organizations. The Romanist thinks that every church should acknowledge the papal supremacy; the Anglican, that all ministers should come within the charmed circle of apostolic succession; the Baptist, that every believer should be immersed into the one church. That it is utterly impracticable to unite the church, as it is now, on any such a basis ought to be apparent to every intelligent observer. Unless all other christians besides the Romanists are arrant hypocrites, how can it be expected that they will surrender their cherished opinions and practices, and adopt those which they intentionally and intelligently reject? How can a Presbyterian become an Anglican until he ceases to be a Presbyterian? How can a Pædo-baptist become a Baptist, when he is not a Baptist? As long as each mind is a unit, it will do its own thinking. As long as men are fallible, they will continue to see only one hemisphere of truth. It is useless for me, seeing only the Presbyterian side of the rounded globe, to expect my Episcopal brother to agree with me when he

sees only the Anglican side. When our Baptist brethren propose to unify the church by immersing us all, it is entirely pertinent to submit the counter proposition, to unite all christians by baptizing both infants and adults by affusion.

There is another class of ardent unionists who propose to unify all christians into one organization upon a broad and liberal basis; upon the consensus of doctrines. This is far more plausible and apparently more practicable than the other. But examined closely, it will be found impossible of application. It is said, Why not throw away all creeds and confessions and come together on the Bible? This could be done satisfactorily with regard to the great mass of scriptural teaching; with regard to the most important element of it. The difficulty of application is seen in those beliefs which are projected into outward practice; those doctrines which crystallize themselves into rites and institutions. To exemplify, I am a believer in infant membership, and present my little babe to receive the ordinance of baptism. My pastor, however, does not so read the Bible, and he cannot conscientiously administer a rite for which he believes he has no divine warrant. Am I to give up infant baptism? Or, must he violate his convictions? Again, how would it be arranged about church government? Is it practicable to combine the essential elements of Independency, Presbyterianism and Episcopacy into one homogeneous system? If not, who is to surrender? It is apparent that, on the basis of mutual toleration, the Calvinist and Arminian can meet at the same table and even preach from the same pulpit; but it is not possible to have both parochial and diocesan Episcopacy in the same church establishment; each congregation cannot be independent, and, at the same time, subject to a system of ecclesiastical courts.

THESE DIVISIONS ARE, IN SOME RESPECTS, BENEFICIAL.

I. It has already been said that they lead to strife. This is true, in many cases; and yet, ordinarily, it will be more correct to say that strife leads to division. Strife is more frequently the parent than the child of division; and, in very many instances, the grandchild is *peace*. If incompatible elements are brought

into contact, discord is the result. Let them be kept apart and there is no trouble. These common-sense principles apply to the church as well as to any other association of men. The renewed nature is not a perfect nature. Indeed, every christian has very much of the old Adam in him. Whenever, therefore, any body of christians is disturbed by internal dissensions, whether from a difference of opinion or of practice, whether from a great or a small cause, and it is found impossible to bring the factions into harmony or into mutual toleration, then it is undoubtedly expedient, wise, necessary, that a separation take place, like that between Abraham and Lot. It is hardly a matter for dispute, that there is more peace and mutual respect and good will in the christian world to-day, than if all the various bodies, with their divergent views, were brought together into one communion. What a Babel it would be, if all the families in a community lived in the same house and were subject to the same rules! It has been quaintly but wisely said, that the best way to secure good feeling among neighbors is to have a strong, high fence between them.

II. The separate churches serve to *keep each other pure*. This is strikingly exemplified in the case of the Greek and Roman Churches. One prominent cause of the great corruption of the Eastern church is undoubtedly the fact, that it holds practically undisputed sway in the territory which it occupies. It is more clearly seen in the papal church. In Protestant countries, this church is on its good behavior, and has a higher class of priests and of members than in lands where no rival communion is known. Contrast this church as it is in Mexico and the South American States with its condition in our country. The difference is immense, and is chiefly due to its contact with the strong Protestant churches. So it was in the early days of Protestantism, when intolerance and persecution of heterodox beliefs were common. The fox-hunting, sermon-buying clergy of England are perhaps largely the product of the almost universal sway of Anglicanism in that part of the island. We all need to be watched, and no church in this country can afford to defy the opinion of its sister communions.

III. The different churches *stimulate each other to activity*.

Competition exerts possibly as positive and healthful an influence in the relations of the several churches to each other as in the affairs of every day life. It may be said to be an unworthy motive, but its quickening influence cannot be questioned. It is a mistake, moreover, to call it unworthy; it may be a low, but it is not an improper motive. What is meant in Heb. x. 24, "Let us consider one another, to provoke unto love and to good works"? An ill-natured, jealous, envious rivalry is, of course, wrong. But when two churches emulate each other and prompt each other to self-denial, and to active, efficient labor in the Master's cause, there is no evil in the rivalry.

IV. There is a fourth and great benefit resulting from the divisions in the church. There is an endless diversity in the works of nature. It has been truthfully said that there are no duplicates. No two blades of grass are exact counterparts of each other. So with the human soul, which is directly the seat of christian influence. While every human spirit is essentially like every other, and there is thus a substantial unity in the race, it is also true that each soul has its peculiarities. As the race is divided into tribes and nations by reason of a common ancestry or a common home, so it is divided into classes according to mental affinities. There is not only a physical Jew, but also a mental Jew; so there is a mental Greek, Roman, Frenchman, German, Englishman, Scotchman. The Gospels are four, doubtless largely because of this fact of human nature. Matthew is adapted to the Jewish mind, swayed by authority; Mark, to the Roman, controlled by power; Luke, to the classic, inquisitive Greek; John, to the reflecting, musing, mystical christian. So we have all kinds of men called by the Spirit into the ministry, for the manifest reason that one style of mind will influence one class of hearers, and another a different class. As a result, there are more won to Christ. So with the different churches. The very fact that these various, separate organizations have sprung into being, shows that there was something in some minds that called for each of them. *The great branches of the church correspond to great classes of minds in the world.* There are natural Romanists, natural Episcopalians, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists. Let these churches

enter together the same community; each will draw to itself its natural adherents. If any one of them is absent, but few of its peculiar element will enter any of the other churches. Let us use a very homely illustration. Men are like fish of different kinds. You must understand the nature of the fish which you hope to catch, and adapt your hook, your bait, and your manner to them. You cannot catch the active, keen-eyed mountain trout with the same tackle that you use for the sluggish, mud loving cat. So you cannot catch a Presbyterian with a Methodist hook. We may be sure that the Lord has made no mistake in allowing his church to be divided as it is. He understands man, and he sees that the peculiarities of the various churches correspond with similar peculiarities in human nature, and that thus the world is to be the more surely and the sooner saved.

WHILE THESE DIVISIONS MAR, THEY DO NOT DESTROY THE UNITY
OF THE CHURCH.

There is a very short and satisfactory argument to prove that the unity of the church has never been lost. We are expressly told (John xi. 42) that the Father always hears the prayers of the Son. Indeed, how could it possibly be otherwise? In John xvii. 20-23, Christ prays for the oneness of all his people, that they may be one even as the Father and the Son are one. This forces us to the alternative, that our Lord made a prayer which God could or would not answer, or else that there has always been a unity of all believers. We cannot hesitate as to our conviction. We believe, we are sure, that the prayer has been answered, and that the church has never been allowed to lose its unity.

Christian people need to study and to remember this prayer. It is the key to this great subject. To many, perhaps to all, it will shed a great flood of light upon their bewildered vision, and give them great peace and joy in believing. To the sad heart that hangs its harp upon the willows, and weeps as it beholds the breaches of Zion, it will administer divine comfort and sweet assurance that the Lord's people are, as they ever have been, one.

But there are two ways in which it may be said that the prayer has been answered. Our papal brother may say, "Yes, the church

is and has always been one. Its unity lies in its connexion with Peter and his successors, as the visible head of the church and the vicar of Christ." The purpose of this paper is irenical and not controversial; it is sufficient, therefore, to say that there are several grave reasons why this cannot be the fulfilment of the prayer. The unity of christians has not been preserved in any one organization. No body of christians has preserved its own unity, and no organization of christians has ever held within its communion all those who "believe on Christ through the word." No one body of christians is the inheritor of this precious prayer of the Redeemer. It is the *common heritage of all believers*. The bond of union is not outward and visible, but is inward and spiritual. All of Christ's people must be one, for they cannot be his people except that they believe on him (verse 20), and that they be in the Father and in the Son (verse 21); and all that believe on him must, *ipso facto*, be one in the Father and the Son. It is the unity of believers, and not the unity of Romanists, Anglicans, Baptists, or Presbyterians, which our blessed Lord had in his mind when he uttered the prayer. No one church is the one church, but all the churches that believe on Christ are together the one church. Each is a branch of the one vine; each, a member of the one body; each, a division of the one army; *quam fluctus diversi, quam mare conjuncti*.

If the bond of union is spiritual, if belief in Christ is the link that unites all these churches into one, it may be well for us to see if this link is broken, or has been worn thin and weak. It may be confidently affirmed that all of God's people are:

I. One in *doctrine*. Of course, this is not true as to all details of belief, or as to modes of expression. It is true, however, that beneath and behind all the variant creeds and confessions of Christendom, there is substantial harmony of belief. There may be the masculine tenor and base and the delicate alto and treble; there may be the psaltery, the timbrel, the harp, the instrument of ten strings and the organ; but to God's ear and to the heart of Christ, the various melodies combine into a rich and glorious unison; Greek, Romanist, Protestant, Lutheran, Reformed, Anglican, Congregationalist, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist, all mak-

ing a choral symphony, which rises as incense to the great white throne.

That there is a consensus of doctrine appears from two facts. *The points in which the christian world agree are in number to the points in which they differ about as three to one*; that is, there are at least three times as many questions with regard to which all christians harmonize as there are with reference to which they are discordant. Any one may satisfy himself that this is true, if he will take the extended creed of any branch of the church to which he does not belong, and see how many of its tenets he accepts and how many he repudiates. The writer of this paper is a decided Presbyterian as to government and Calvinist as to theology; and he has interested himself recently in testing this matter by reading the Thirty-nine Articles of the Episcopal Church, the creed of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, and of the local Baptist church where he resides. The result more than confirmed what is stated above. Take the Westminster Shorter Catechism, with its one hundred and seven questions and answers. How many of those answers would the Baptist, the Methodist, the Episcopalian, the Lutheran, the Papist reject? Is there one that would repudiate twenty-six of the number? Surely not.

The second fact is more interesting than the one already stated. The points of doctrine with regard to which the christian world agree are in *importance* to those with regard to which they differ as one hundred to one. On all the questions that are essential to salvation there is, there must be, agreement. Those who deny these fundamental doctrines do not believe on Christ, and are thus outside the circle of faith. The nine articles of the Evangelical Alliance cover the broad territory within which the millions of believers are to be found. Christians differ as to external rites, as to modes of discipline, as to habits of worship, none of which ever saved the soul of any man; and they agree as to the great questions of theology and soteriology, which involve the glory of God and the salvation of men.

II. As "truth is in order to godliness," so belief very largely determines practice. If christians of all denominations are substantially one in doctrine, so are they in *life*. The Jew is scat-

tered over the civilized world, but can be recognized wherever found by his appearance. The christian is equally ubiquitous, and can be as readily known by his conduct. Christian character is formed under the influence of Bible truth employed by the Divine Spirit. All believers are the children of a common Father. They all bear the family impress; God-fearing, man-loving, self-denying. Some have the traits but poorly developed; some cover them with much worldly-mindedness. But, babes or men, they all more or less exhibit the distinctive traits. The proportion of genuine christians does not vary greatly probably in the several branches of the church. The living child of God finds his brethren in all the communions.

III. One in faith, one in life, Christ's people are one in *hope*. Go where you will and this is seen to be true. The poor woman that drudges over the wash-tub has the same blessed anticipations, kindled by the same precious promises, as the noble queen who wields the sceptre of the British empire. This fact is illustrated in the hymns of the church, which are largely the expression of christian feeling. Go to any congregation of believers, and you are likely to hear the same sweet songs, of which Milton said, there are no songs like the songs of Zion. Mothers, the world over, hush their babes to rest with a lullaby that tells of the love of Jesus, a lullaby that sings the happy trust of their own souls. One in song, so every believer meets his fellow-christians at the same mercy-seat. How like we are to one another when upon our knees in soul communion with our blessed Lord! The cross of Christ, our common trust, brings every believer together in loving sympathy.

IV. One in faith, one in life, one in spirit; so we are one in *destiny*. We have different names and different places and habits of worship, but we are traveling a common road that leads to a common home. In the New Jerusalem, there will hardly be a Greek quarter, and a Roman, and a Protestant. We shall all enter the same pearly gates and tread the same golden streets, eat of the same tree and drink of the same river of life, wear the same crowns, wave the same palms, and sing the same new song of Moses and the Lamb, gather around the same throne and bow in grateful adoration to the same loving, precious Saviour.

Yes, God's people are one, his church is one; Christ is not divided. There may be, there are differences; some serious, many trivial, none essential. They are but the surface scratches upon the Apollo of the Vatican; they mar its beauty, but do not destroy its magnificence. Bacon quotes one of the fathers as saying: "Christ's coat indeed had no seam, but the church's vesture was of divers colors." This beautifully illustrates the truth. The bridal robe of the church is variegated in color, but there is neither rent nor seam in it.

PRACTICAL LESSONS.

I. *Close up the ranks.* This does not mean that all denominational lines shall be at once obliterated. This is neither possible nor desirable. It may be that the millennial church will not be an outward unit. As the world is now, there is need for the leading branches of the church. But there are many needless divisions. The various bodies of the Presbyterian faith have held a Pan-Presbyterian council; why may not this be made a regular body with a decennial meeting? Why not have a quadrennial General Assembly of all the branches of the church in this country, to which shall be committed the work of Foreign Missions and of Publication? Why may not the various branches of the Methodist church thus unite; preserving, at least for the present, the autonomy of each, but having some outward bond for all that so nearly agree in faith and practice? In many cases where the differences are like the colors of a dissolving view, there ought to be actual organic union. With more of Christ and less of self this might be accomplished. But let us have no forced unions of unwilling hearts.

II. *Avoid strife.* This is the most important suggestion. It is not meant that doctrinal preaching should cease. Far from it, as this is the very meat and marrow of a muscular faith. But we can hold the truth in love. We can carefully abstain from all caricature, travesty, hostility. We can sedulously avoid all controversy, or occasions of controversy, with our brethren. When the gun is loaded and we are ready to fire, we can be careful that it is not trained upon the lines of our comrades, but is directed to the fortress of

our common foe. We can carefully abstain from entering territory already occupied.

III. *Help one another.* This can be done in many ways; and we shall find that he who watereth others shall himself also be watered. It is said that the late Dr. Johns, the beloved Episcopal minister of Baltimore, never passed the church of another denomination without lifting up a prayer for a blessing upon it. Did this spirit prevail, men would say, "Behold how these christians love one another"; and it would go far towards the evangelization of our race, in accordance with our Saviour's prayer, "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: *that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.*"

J. A. QUARLES.

V. THE PRESBYTERIAN ORIGIN OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE.

THE wisest and best men in every age have felt the indispensable necessity of religion to the stability of society. Hear the testimony of that distinguished jurist, statesman and philosopher, Sir James Macintosh, in his *Letter on the Study of Law*: "I am now to treat of religion, and of the claims which it has upon the acknowledgment and support of him who sustains the character of an advocate in our courts of justice. The opinions of men have experienced a thousand changes; kingdoms that have been most powerful have been removed; the form of the earth itself has undergone various alterations; but amid these grand and ruinous concussions, religion has remained unshaken; and a principle so consentaneous to the first formation of our nature must remain, until by some power, of which at present we have no conception, the laws of that nature are universally dissolved. Powers thus singular must have their foundation in truth; for men may rest in truth, but they can never rest in error. What is thus true must also be just; and, of course, to acknowledge its influence must be the spontaneous and natural effusion of a love of truth; and the love of truth either is really, or is affected to be the character of

those who have dedicated themselves to the study of our laws. Thus naturally, even upon the first glance, do the characters of the lawyer and the supporter of religion meet. The conclusion must be, that he who affects to doubt of the fundamental truths of religion, much more he who dares to deride them, is dissolving by fraud and violence a tie which all good men have agreed to hold in respect, and the violation of which must render the violator unworthy the esteem and support of his fellow-creatures."

The opinion of Washington in regard to the necessity of religion to sustain the morals of a nation, cannot be brought too often to the notice of the people of the United States. In his "Farewell Address" he says: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable. *In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens.* The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connexions with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in the courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, *reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.*"

The utter inefficiency of all mere human instrumentalities to protect and elevate the race has been repeatedly demonstrated. And the reason is obvious. Man has a physical, intellectual and moral constitution, and all these schemes ensure defeat by running counter to some of the laws of that constitution. Besides, that constitution has been deranged by sin, and none of these instruments have the power of restoring it. They all spring from that nature of his, and they cannot rise higher than their source. If, then, there be a system calculated to remedy this evil, that must be the highest order of patriotism which employs it. The gospel is

that system. It is adapted to every want of man's varied nature, and meets the demands of his intellect, his conscience, his affections and his energies. It makes him a new creature in Christ Jesus, and places him under the tutelage of the blessed Spirit. Having rescued him from the fall, it places him in harmonious relation to every law of his nature. It teaches him that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, he is to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world. It makes him provident for time by making him provident for eternity. It renders him obedient to the law of the land by making him first a law unto himself. It induces him to relax his grasp upon the pelf of this world by placing within his reach the durable riches of another. It opens around him a sphere of christian usefulness to others. It inspires him with new desires, and constrains him with motives never felt before "to live, not unto himself, but to him who died for him and rose again." Henceforth, he is a blessing to the community and the world.

To what achievement similar to this can infidelity point? What has it done to ameliorate society and make a miserable world happy? Where are its institutions, its happy, prosperous social and political establishments? Is it not a mockery to ask the question? Let France, reserved in the righteous providence of God as the unhappy subject of the experiment, proclaim once for all that the reign of infidelity is the reign of terror and the reign of death! Infidelity, left to itself, would subvert all government. A nation of infidels could not exist. Well did Edmund Burke remark: "Infidels are outlaws of the constitution, not of this country, but of the human race." And Dr. Arnold justly observes: "To speak of religious liberty when we mean the liberty to be irreligious, or of freedom of conscience when our conscience is our convenience, is no other than a mockery and a profanation."

The gospel being the richest boon God has given to the race, and essential to its welfare for this world and the next, its widest diffusion is the dictate of the purest patriotism. It devolves an obligation upon every man, every citizen, every christian, to disseminate it as the only guardian of man's rights and interests for time and eternity. It is not only the cause of God, but also the cause of man, the cause of philanthropy, of patriotism, of society,

of civilization, of government, the cause of country, the cause of the world.

It is to the christianity of the Old and the New Testaments that mankind, in all ages, has owed whatever measure of liberty they enjoyed. The civil government of the ancient Hebrews was the government of a free people, not only the first, but the only free government of antiquity. The Mosaic constitution was pervaded with popular sympathies and the spirit of liberty. The best wisdom of modern times in the difficult science of legislation was anticipated by Moses. The moderns are not the real discoverers; they have but applied the truths and principles established by the first, the wisest, the ablest of legislators. In an age of barbarism and tyranny, Moses solved the problem how a people could be self-governed and yet well governed; how men could be kept in order and still be free, and how the liberty of the individual could be reconciled with the welfare of the community.

Municipal assemblies managed the public business of the cities, assemblies of the tribes administered the general affairs of the tribes, and the assemblies of the commonwealth those of all Israel. Though united by general interests and formed into a confederacy, yet each tribe was a sovereign state, and gave far less power to the confederate government than these United States ever gave to the general government.

Now, the head of the Hebrew nation was Christ. It was "*the Angel of the Lord*," as the martyr Stephen declared to the Jews, who appeared to Moses in the burning bush, and who spake to Moses on Sinai and gave him the "lively oracles." The government was a theocracy. Messiah was king. The Hebrew theocracy shadowed forth the ultimate character of all the kingdoms of earth. The true relation of the state to Christ was set forth therein. There was no confounding of church and state then, as so many suppose. The church was not the nation, nor the nation the church. Each had its distinct rulers, courts, laws, subjects, revenues, penalties and duration. The church had her courts of the synagogue and ecclesiastical sanhedrim; the state, those of the gate and the civil sanhedrim. Pre-existent ecclesiastical laws and the ceremonial laws were those of the church; the judicial, those

of the state. The normal character of a republic was exhibited in it. Just as the principles of the Jewish religion were those of the christian religion, only not so clearly revealed, just as the ecclesiastical principles of the theocracy were, when subsequently divested of their Jewish covering, the same as those on which the New Testament church was founded, just so were the governmental principles those which are destined to characterize every government on earth. "The Lord shall be king over all the earth; in that day there shall be one Lord." "The kingdoms of the earth shall become the kingdoms of the Lord." They will still continue the kingdoms of this world, and at the same time be "the kingdoms of the Lord." Their moral character will be changed. The theocracy was a mirror which reflected the universal church and the universal state. The elements of the gospel were in it, the elements of the christian church were in it, the elements of a pure, permanent, universal republic were in it. Every government will, one day, be a *Christocracy*, and this was represented in the Hebrew theocracy. This does not confound or unite two distinct institutions, the church and state. There is no inconsistency in affirming that two institutions are under one Divine Head, when each is kept to its sphere, without interference or collision between them. The planets which belong to our solar system revolve around one common centre, the sun, and yet their orbits are distinct. In like manner church and state are both subject to Christ, the head of all power, and yet these institutions are kept each within its own peculiar orbit, to transcend which, and encroach upon that of each other, would be to rebel against the authority of their common head. Christ wears "many crowns" upon his august brow. Christ and Cæsar may occupy the same throne in the state without the least interference.

Christ came not to institute a new church, but to open a new sphere for his ancient church, and start it upon its new career, the restrictions of the ancient theocracy being done away with, and all nations, instead of one nation, designed to enjoy the honors and blessings that shall be conferred by their mediatorial King. The government of the Hebrew church, and also of the Hebrew state, was by assemblies, *Presbyteries*, for such were the synagogues and

the sanhedrim, composed of presbyters or elders. Such, too, is the government of the New Testament church, a government of assemblies, of *Presbyteries*, not of presbyters. Archbishop Whately concedes that "wherever a Jewish synagogue existed that was brought to embrace the gospel, the apostles there did not so much form a christian church as make an existing congregation christian by introducing the christian sacraments and worship, leaving the machinery of government unchanged, the rulers of synagogues, the elders and other officers, being already provided in the existing institutions."

The Presbyterian Church is older than the Reformation, older than the apostles, older than the New Testament. The Presbyterianism of the Old Testament church did not originate with the Jewish dispensation, but ante-dated it, and had its rise in the earliest age, the patriarchal, the government of the church in that day being by presbyters or elders. The patriarchal system exists in families among all nations. It is founded on the natural relation between parents and children. Among those races retaining a primitive simplicity in their mode of life, this organization of society is still found. As the father governs his own household, so the head of the family, *i. e.*, of the elder branch, governs the younger, and the head of the whole tribe governs both. As the natural heads of houses, families, and tribes were the hereditary magistrates, the name *old men*, *elders*, was the common appellation for the rulers of the people. The same usage of the term occurs in application to domestic arrangements. Eliezer of Damascus, Abraham's steward, is called (Gen. xxiv. 2), not "his eldest servant of his house," as our translation has it, but "his servant, *the elder* (*i. e.*, ruler) of his house." So in Gen. i. 7, we read of "all the servants of Pharaoh, the *elders* of his house," as well as "all the *elders* of the land of Egypt." These *elders* and the *senators* of Psa. cv. 22, are identical in Hebrew.

The Scriptures exhibit the Presbyterate as existing in the very earliest ages, and continuing to the very latest; whilst Prelacy is conceded by its most learned divines and scholars to have no foundation whatever in the Word of God. Their able organ, *The Rock*, (London) faithfully reflects their views in recent issues,

(November 11th, 1887, and December 2d, 1887): "The fact is, that diocesan episcopacy, as we know it, is of comparatively modern growth; and so far from standing on Bible authority as a divine institution, it is just as much, or as little, divine as the office of Lord Mayor of London. No man now contends that the *επισκοπος* of Scripture was of a different order from the elder, or that modern diocesan episcopacy can stand now as it has so long stood, like a pyramid upon its apex, on the minute points of support afforded by one or two misunderstood passages. Bishops, of course, there were in Scripture times, but their modern analogue must, if anywhere, be found in the rectors of large towns, such as Brighton or Bradford. Every scholar has long given up, as a mere piece of patristic ignorance, the pretense that apostles were the prototypes of bishops. Diocesan episcopacy stands solely on the law of the land, and the attempt, so often made in these days, to base it upon the high ground of scriptural authority, as divinely ordered, and therefore of permanent and essential obligation, will only rebound with destructive force upon itself." "The question is, Was there anything whatever in the first age of the church which answered to our idea of a bishop? The unanimous reply given to this question by the most learned scholars of our day is, that there was not. The bishop, as we find him now, is the creation of post-apostolic times. The presbyter-bishops were the only primitive bishops, and it is only in later ages that the diocesan bishops have quite swallowed up and reduced to subjection the order of presbyters, which certainly has whatever advantage lies in priority. The Dean of Canterbury, lately speaking on this point, adverted to the hackneyed quotation of Ignatius, 'Do nothing without the bishop;' and said it simply meant, 'Do nothing without the incumbent,' and was addressed to the whole church, advising them always to consult their pastor."

On the other hand, the Presbyterian Church, based upon the Scriptures, the Rock of Ages, claims, not simply an apostolic succession, but a far more ancient one, even the patriarchal succession. Through all the dispensations, whatever else be changed, it remains unchanged, ever the same venerable historic church, like its Divine Author, the same yesterday, to day, and for ever! The

one grand olive tree, which the Lord God hath planted, making wild olive trees, grafted in, fruitful, in proportion as they partake of its root and fatness, bearing its fruit in all ages, in all the ages of time, and in all the ages of eternity! In comparison with it, how ridiculous are the pretensions of episcopacy! It becomes not the mushroom of a night to vaunt itself in presence of the majestic cedar of Lebanon!

The Presbyterian Church is governed by assemblies, and the liberty of assemblies is essential to the preservation of the gospel. John Knox well said: "Take from us the freedom of assemblies, and you take from us the evangel!" It is a great mistake to suppose that a particular form of church government is a matter of little consequence. Christ has not only instituted the government but its form. The relation between a form of church government and its doctrine and worship is direct, close and intimate. It is the shell which guards the kernel. It is the body which covers and preserves the soul. Every student of ecclesiastical history is forced to see this. Why is it that certain forms of government, and certain systems of doctrine, and certain modes of worship are found uniformly associated together? Why are Presbyterianism and Calvinism in such close sympathy and union? Many of the churches of New England were once Presbyterian as to church government, and Calvinistic as to doctrine. When Presbyterianism was supplanted by Congregationalism, how did it happen that the Calvinism was not retained, but in like manner was supplanted by Socinianism? This same result uniformly obtains, sooner or later. But how can it be explained, if a particular form of government be a matter of indifference, and have, as many suppose, no influence upon the doctrines and worship of a church? In Scotland, during the time that assemblies were suppressed and Presbyteries neglected, ministers became negligent, immorality and heresy prevailed and popery increased. In Germany, where infidel tenets were substituted for the pure Word of God, this lamentable condition is traceable to the deficient constitution of the German churches, and their entire want of control over the opinions of their own ministers. These instances show there is not a more unfounded notion than that a particular form of church government is a matter of indifference.

If the doctrines of the gospel need for their protection the polity of the gospel, without which their purity and integrity cannot be maintained, nor the freedom of the church secured, still less could it be expected that those doctrines, such as the doctrine of confederation, the doctrine of representation, not enshrined in their congenial Presbyterian polity, should, disembodied, be able to engender and conserve the freedom of society and the state.

The famous infidel, Lord Bolingbroke, was one day sitting in his house, reading Calvin's *Institutes*, when he received a morning visit from Dr. Church, an Episcopal minister. "I have been studying Calvin's *Institutes*," said he; "what do you think of those matters, Doctor?" "O my Lord, we don't think about such antiquated stuff; we preach the plain doctrines of virtue and morality, and have long laid aside those abstruse points of grace." "Look you, Doctor," said Lord Bolingbroke, "you know I don't believe the Bible to be a divine revelation, but they who do can never defend it on any principle but that doctrine. To say truth, I have at times been almost persuaded to believe it upon this view of things; and there is one argument which has gone far with me in behalf of its authenticity; which is, that the belief in it exists upon earth even when committed to the care of such as you, who pretend to believe it and yet deny the only principle upon which it is defensible." The connexion between ecclesiastical and civil polity and ecclesiastical and civil liberty is direct and striking. The historian, Ranke, (as reported by the late Dr. Henry Boynton Smith,) affirmed: "We may consider Calvin as the founder of the Free States of North America. It was his doctrine which shaped the men who left home and country, in order to preserve their religious freedom in the wilds of America." The historian, Bancroft, well says: "Calvinism is gradual republicanism," and "*He that will not honor the memory and respect the influence of Calvin knows but little of the origin of American liberty.*" "Episcopacy and monarchy are feared as natural allies." It was the declaration of Dr. Chandler, a distinguished Episcopal divine, that "Episcopacy can never thrive in a republican government, nor republican principles in an Episcopal church." The admitting of the laity to some share in its government is pronounced by Bishop

Seabury to be "incongruous to every idea of Episcopal government." It is a fact so obvious as to be admitted by those who have no sympathy with our form of polity, that Presbyterianism in the church is the mother of republicanism in the state. Queen Elizabeth, that imperious sovereign, hated Presbytery because she deemed it inconsistent with monarchy. King James, educated a Calvinist and a Presbyterian, when leaving Scotland to ascend the vacant throne of Elizabeth, assured his countrymen of his love for their church, and of his determination to support it. He had, however, hardly crossed the Tweed before he began to manifest his aversion from a form of church discipline which he regarded as essentially republican. The submissive demeanor of the English bishops, and their high doctrine as to the power of kings, confirmed a conversion which had already taken place. The Scottish presbyters were accustomed to urge him to repent of his sins. The English bishops, on their knees, assured him he spoke by the immediate assistance of God! It is not wonderful, therefore, that James adopted the cause of the latter and made it his own. A favorite saying of his was, that "Presbytery agreed with monarchy as well as God with the devil." It was the struggle of the Scotch for the liberty of their church which was the means of preserving the liberties of England. Charles I. had succeeded in governing England for twelve years without a parliament. When the Scotch formed their national convention for resisting the tyranny of the king, Charles found it necessary then to summon a parliament. One object that he kept before him was the extermination of Calvinism from the English Church on political grounds.

The natural tendency of our faith is to develop the principles of political liberty. Charles I. was no mean logician when he declared that "there was not a wiser man seen since Solomon than he who said, 'No bishop, no king!'" The temporal follows the spiritual, and whom Christ makes free, he is free indeed.

The British constitution bears more distinct marks of the genius and high principle of three Presbyterian ministers, Knox, Henderson and Carstairs, than of any three lawyers England ever produced.

Carlyle, speaking of Presbyterianism in Scotland, and referring

to the noble outburst in St. Giles's church, in Edinburgh, followed by the sublime scene in Greyfriars churchyard, where men signed the old League and Covenant with their blood, (acts and scenes which, in their remote consequences, took off the heads of Wentworth, Laud, and King Charles, and secured liberty for mankind,) says: "The tumult in the High Church in Edinburgh spread into a universal battle,—a struggle over all these realms; and there came out, after fifty years' struggling, what we call the glorious Revolution, a *habeas corpus* act, free parliaments, and much else." And of this same attempt to enslave Scotland Macaulay writes, "To this step our country owes its freedom;" and Hallam says, "In its ultimate results it preserved the liberties and overthrew the monarchy of England."

" The Solemn League and Covenant
Cost Scotland blood, cost Scotland tears;
But it sealed Freedom's sacred cause!
If thou art a slave, indulge thy sneers."—*Robert Burns.*

Mr. Carlyle says, with truth: "It was among the noblest human heroisms, this Puritanism of ours. That the sense of difference between right and wrong had filled all time and all space for man, and bodied itself forth into a heaven and hell for him: this constitutes the grand feature of those Puritan, old-christian ages; this is the element which stamps them as heroic, and has rendered their works great, manlike, fruitful to all generations. It is by far the memorablest achievement of our species; without that element in some form or other nothing of heroic had ever been among us."

In a similar strain Mr. Froude, the historian, observes: "Calvinism has borne ever an inflexible front to illusion and mendacity, and has preferred rather to be ground to powder like flint than to bend before violence, or to melt under enervating temptation. These men were possessed of all the qualities which give nobility and grandeur to human nature, men whose life was as upright as their intellect was commanding, and their public aims untainted with selfishness; unalterably just where duty required them to be stern, but with the tenderness of woman in their hearts, frank, true, cheerful, humorous, as unlike sour fanatics as it is possible to imagine any one, and able in some way to sound

the key-note to which every brave and faithful heart in Europe instinctively vibrated. . . . Calvinism is not a system of opinions merely, but an attempt to make the will of God as revealed in the Bible an authoritative guide for social as well as personal direction. The Calvinists have been called intolerant. Intolerance of an enemy who is trying to kill you seems to me a pardonable state of mind. It is no easy matter to tolerate lies, clearly convicted of being lies, in any circumstances; specially, it is not easy to tolerate lies that strut about in the name of religion; but there is no reason to suppose that the Calvinists, at the beginning, would have thought of meddling with the church if they had been themselves let alone. They would have formed communities apart. Like the Israelites whom they wished to resemble, they would have withdrawn into the wilderness—the Pilgrim Fathers actually did so—to worship the God of their fathers, and would have left argument and example to work their proper effect. They were crushed down, but they rose again. They were splintered and torn, but no power could bend or melt them. They abhorred, as no body of men ever more abhorred, all conscious mendacity, all impurity, all moral wrong of every kind, so far as they could recognize it. They attracted to their ranks almost every man in Western Europe that ‘hated a lie.’ Whatever exists at this moment, in England and Scotland, of conscientious fear of doing evil, is the remnant of the convictions which were branded by the Calvinists into the people’s hearts. The discipline which it once aspired to maintain has fallen slack. Desire for ease and self-indulgence drag forever, in quiet times, at the heel of noble aspirations, while the shadow struggles to remain and preserve its outline, when the substance is passing away. This was not the religion of the fathers; this was not the Calvinism which overthrew spiritual wickedness, and hurled kings from their thrones, and purged England and Scotland, for a time at least, of lies and charlatanry. Calvinism was the spirit which rises in revolt against untruth; the spirit which has appeared and re-appeared, and in due time will appear again, unless God be a delusion and man be as the beasts that perish. For it is but the inflashing upon the conscience of the nature and origin of the laws by which mankind

are governed, laws which exist whether we acknowledge them or whether we deny them, and will have their way, to our weal or woe, according to the attitude in which we please to place ourselves toward them; inherent, like the laws of gravity, in the nature of things, not made by us, not to be altered by us, but to be discerned and obeyed by us, at our everlasting peril."

Let these weighty words of an impartial thinker and historian be well pondered by us in these days of laxity and demoralization. Society must needs suffer in its highest interest when Calvinism, Puritanism, declines. This is a fact established by all history. Bishop Burnet records the fact that the managers in the parliament which overturned Presbytery and restored Episcopacy were, during the time of its sitting, "*almost perpetually drunk.*" When the Puritans were subdued the corruption of England rivalled Rome. Parliament endowed the illegitimate children of King Charles and nearly a score of mistresses, who were honored at court and pampered on the public treasury. The Church of England stands now precisely where she stood at the death of Elizabeth. Hear the testimony of one of her own prelates, Bishop Short: "The kingdom has, for the last two hundred years, been making rapid strides in every species of improvement, and a corresponding alteration in the laws on every subject has taken place; *during this period nothing has been remedied in the church.*" Its condition has been thus described by a writer during that period: "I could name whoremongers, confessing their lechery and yet enjoying their livings, and also having their mouths open and not stopped nor forbidden to preach. I know also some that have said mass divers years since it was prohibited, and upon their examination confessed the same, yet are in quiet possession of their ecclesiastical promotions. I know double-beneficed men that do nothing but eat, drink, sleep, play at dice-tables, and read service in the church, but teach nothing at all."

So, too, in our land are found similar "successors of the apostles," whose energies are devoted to undermining the small remains of Protestantism in their communion, and supplanting these by one Romish element after another. The first step from Puritanism is the first step to Romanism. The learned Sismondi declares the

truth: "Geneva has been the champion of double liberty, civil and religious; of English liberty, wise and powerful at the same time; progressive, and yet conservative."

The infidel Hume, with all his hatred of the Puritan character, was yet compelled to pay them the following glorious tribute: "So absolute was the authority of the crown that the precious spark of liberty had been kindled, and was preserved by the Puritans alone, and it was to this sect the English owe the whole freedom of their constitution." The whole freedom of the English constitution due to the Puritans! And the freedom of the American constitution due to the Puritans! (using the term in its popular acceptance.) This, of itself, were sufficient to invest the name *Puritan* with imperishable honor and glory, by the testimony of their worst enemies! Let those who enjoy, or ever enjoyed, the blessings of civil and religious liberty beware how they defame the character of those heroic men who, at such costly sacrifice of treasure and blood, spread the table at which they are gratuitously fed! To bear false witness against any one is disgraceful. But to bear false witness against a benefactor—to slander the saviours of Liberty, the fathers of the state, the patriots of society—is a crime which justly brings upon the wretch the curse of a world! And who are the men that are thus reviled and calumniated? Milton, Owen, Howe, Edwards, Charnock, Bates, Baxter, Hampden, Sidney, and a host of other worthies, among the most illustrious names that adorn the annals of literature, and the brightest stars that illumine the political firmament! What a splendid galaxy of genius and worth! Names, endowments, achievements, sacrifices, devotion to principle, that have made the name *Puritan* "a title of intellectual and moral nobility"! Not a ray the less, no paling the brightness of their glory, when the dogs of earth bay the stars of heaven!

They have been charged with intolerance; but it was the treatise of an illustrious Puritan, John Owen, Vice-Chancellor of Oxford University, which imbued the civilized world of that age with the principles of toleration that now obtain. The credit is by many given to the writings of John Locke, the philosopher; but it is forgotten (if ever known) that John Locke was a student under John Owen, and imbibed his master's principles and embalmed

them in his essays.¹ It is true that certain offenses were then deemed cognizable by the civil law which are not so considered now. Witches were hung in New England. So were they in Old England. The great and good Sir Matthew Hale did this. No purer name adorns the annals of jurisprudence. It was owing to the doctrine which then universally prevailed, the relation of the magistrate to the first table of the decalogue: a doctrine, be it understood, which has never yet been settled, which in our day has been revived, and which is undergoing a keen discussion now, both in Europe and in this country. That the Puritans were the *victims* of intolerance no student of history will venture to deny. Their enemies "had no patience with them," as the jail, the sword, the axe and the fagot will testify in thousands of instances. The following inscription was put upon the coffin of one who perished in prison: "This is the corpse of Roger Rippon, servant of Christ, and Her Majesty's faithful subject, who is the last of seventeen which that great enemy of God, the Archbishop of Canterbury, with his high commissioners, have murdered in Newgate within these five years, manifestly for the testimony of Jesus Christ." Take one specimen of the tender mercies of Archbishop Laud. Dr. Alexander Leighton, a Scotch divine and father of Archbishop Leighton, published a book in defence of Presbyterianism and against Prelacy. He was brought into the Star Chamber and sentenced to be pilloried, whipped, his ears cut off, his nose slit, to be branded in the face with a hot iron, fined ten thousand pounds, and then to lie in the Fleet prison for life! When this sentence was pronounced, Laud pulled off his cap and gave God thanks for it! Laud records in his private diary, with great gusto, how literally the sentence was executed, and adds: "On that day seven nights his sores upon his back, ears, nose and face being not yet cured, he was whipped again at the pillory in Cheapside and had the remainder of his sentence executed upon him, by cutting off the other ear, slitting the other side of his nose, and branding the

¹ The teachings of the Confession of Faith on liberty of conscience were well known throughout the kingdom long before Jeremy Taylor's essay appeared. And of what value were the *theoretical* sentiments of a man whose *practice* was in notorious and painful contrast with his oily sentimentalism?

other cheek." He was then carried back to prison, where he continued in close confinement ten years, until released by the Long Parliament.

"The noble army of martyrs praise thee!" But to that noble army episcopacy contributes none, save the victims of its satanic cruelty. Episcopacy has no martyrs. How could it have any? To point to Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer is to betray ignorance of their writings and principles, which plainly shew that, though nominally in her, they were not of her, and that it was their anti-Episcopal principles which brought them to the stake. Bishop Hooper states that, in the year 1550 (previous to the revisal of the articles), Archbishop Cranmer was sincerely bent on advancing the purity of doctrine, agreeing in all things with the Helvetic churches, which were strictly Calvinistic. Cranmer not only maintained a close correspondence with the Genevan reformer, and consulted him on every important step of the English Reformation, but communicated to him his plan of a common confession for all the Reformed churches, of which Calvin expressed his high approbation.¹ Knox, whose sentiments were thoroughly Calvinistic, was one of the persons employed in reviewing the articles. The Puritans, who were decidedly of the same sentiments, never expressed the smallest scruple about the doctrinal articles, and the English dissenters continued to subscribe them until 1779.

The Puritan ministers, pursued by Laud and his followers, harassed, persecuted, hunted by these hell-hounds from one diocese to another, turned their thoughts to the wilds of America. "The Puritans," says Hume, "shipped themselves off to America, and laid there the foundations of a government which possessed all the liberty, both civil and religious, of which they found themselves bereaved in their native country. But their enemies, unwilling that they should anywhere enjoy ease and contentment, and dreading, perhaps, the consequences of so disaffected a colony, prevailed on the king to issue a proclamation debarring these devotees access even into these inhospitable deserts." Let this testimony of an enemy, and an infidel, forever settle the question as to the true motives which brought the Puritans to these shores.

¹ See Burnet's History, and Strype's Cranmer.

Nor did they escape persecution even here, in some of the colonies. The first Presbyterian minister who preached in the city of New York, Francis Makemie, was, for no other crime than preaching the gospel and administering baptism to a child, seized and thrust into prison in New York; nor was he suffered to depart till there had been extorted from him a sum equal to all the fees and expenses of his prosecution, amounting to between two and three hundred dollars.

The Hon. Archibald D. Murphy, in his oration at the University of North Carolina, in 1827, said: "Religious intolerance drove from England a great number of Presbyterians, Quakers and others, who sought refuge in the Virginia colony. They there soon met with the same persecution which had driven them from their native country. They were compelled to leave the colony; and Providence directing their course through the wilderness, they settled near Pasquotank and Perquimans, and formed the germ of the Carolina colony. A civil government was established purely representative, a circumstance to which may be attributed, in a great degree, the republican feelings and opinions which soon characterized the colony, and which led to the plan of civil polity under which we now live. When the Lords Proprietors discovered that the colony was likely to become numerous and powerful, they endeavored to restrain the civil and religious liberty they had promised to emigrants. They established a new form of government, declaring their object to be to make the government of the colony agree as nearly as possible with the monarchy of which it was a part, and to avoid erecting a numerous democracy. The plan failed. The prosperity of the colony declined, public morals relaxed, the laws lost their energy, a general spirit of discontent grew up and ripened into rebellion, the governors became corrupt and the people idle and vicious. The plan was then abolished. Two factions then arose: one that wished to establish a high-toned prerogative government; the other consisted of high churchmen, who gained the ascendancy, and by their violence brought the government into contempt. Their object was to deprive all dissenters of the right of suffrage, to curtail their civil rights, and render their situation so oppressive as to compel them to leave the

colony. A party of French Huguenots had emigrated to the colony, to enjoy that liberty of conscience and of worship which was denied to them in their native country. These people, entitled by their sufferings no less than by their Protestantism to the friendship and hospitality of the colonists, were treated with a cruelty that disgraced the high-church party. Being aliens, they were incapable of holding lands until they were naturalized; and this party, having the ascendancy in the Assembly, not only refused to naturalize them, but declared their marriages by ministers not ordained by Episcopal bishops illegal, and their children illegitimate! The progress of this violent, persecuting spirit was checked by the wise and conciliating measures adopted by Governor Archdale, a Quaker."

The London Nonconformist says: "It is long since we found that the most intolerant of all churchmen are the so-called broad-churchmen, whose sentimental charity is beautiful, but who hate with a viciousness that exceeds the most vicious of all the ordinary theological sects."

The spirit of prelacy is one and the same in all ages. It is not dead, but sleepeth. Let it have power, and it will proceed to the same monstrous extremes now as then. Well said Rutherford: "*Prelacy is the nest and the egg to hatch and bring forth popery,*" that gigantic satanic conspiracy against the theocracy of the Lord Jesus Christ and the liberties of the world. Pope Innocent III. acted in keeping with the system when he excommunicated the barons who wrested *magna charta* from King John.

It has been asserted that the famous Maryland Act of Toleration of 1649 was the act of Romanists. This is a mistake. Recent investigation has shown that two-thirds of the legislature which passed that act were Protestants.

It is a true remark, verified by all history, which a Belgian statesman, De Lavaleye, makes in his admirable pamphlet, "Protestantism and Catholicism in their bearing upon the liberty and prosperity of nations": "The Roman religion has not fitted the French to live in freedom, to tolerate each other, and to govern themselves. The true home of the Catholic clergy is Rome, as they themselves announce. They will therefore sacrifice their

country, if need be, to the welfare or to the dominion of the pope, the infallible head of their religion and the representative of God upon earth."

The Abbe Michaud utters the following weighty words: "The Romanism of the present day, so far from being a religion, is only an aggressive and contentious political system, and, in view of the gigantic organization which the Jesuits and Rome are everywhere developing, a religious war is inevitable and even near at hand. For it is to be observed that the Jesuits and Romanists aim not only at universal religious supremacy, but also at supremacy in civil and political matters. 'The temporal,' say they, 'must be subordinate to the spiritual, the state to the church.'"

Ponder well the horrible oath which binds the vassals of Rome: "I, A. B., now in the presence of Almighty God, the blessed Virgin Mary, the blessed Michael the archangel, the blessed St. John Baptist, the holy apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and the saints and sacred host of heaven, and to you, my ghostly father, do declare from my heart, without mental reservation, that his holiness the pope is Christ's vicar-general, and is the true and only head of the Catholic or universal church throughout the earth; and that by the virtue of the keys of binding and loosing, given to his holiness by my Saviour Jesus Christ, he hath power to depose heretical kings, princes, states, commonwealths, and governments, all being illegal without his sacred confirmation, and that they may be safely destroyed; therefore, to the utmost of my power, I shall and will defend this doctrine and his holiness' rights and customs against all usurpers of the heretical authority whatsoever, especially against the now pretended authority and Church of England, and all adherents, in regard that they and she be usurpal and heretical, opposing the sacred mother church of Rome. I do renounce and disown any allegiance as due to any heretical king, prince, or state named Protestant, or obedience to any of their inferior magistrates or officers. I do further declare the doctrines of the Church of England, of the Calvinists, Huguenots, and of others of the name of Protestants, to be damnable, and they themselves are damned and to be damned that will not forsake the same. I do further declare, that I will help, assist and advise all

or any of his holiness' agents, in any place wherever I shall be, in England, Scotland, and in Ireland, or in any other territory or kingdom I shall come to, and do my utmost to extirpate the heretical Protestants' doctrine, and to destroy all their pretended powers, regal or otherwise. I do further promise and declare that, notwithstanding I am dispensed to assume any religion heretical for the propagating of the mother church's interest, to keep secret and private all her agents' counsels from time to time as they intrust me, and not to divulge, directly or indirectly, by word, writing or circumstance whatsoever, but to execute all that shall be proposed, given in charge, or discovered unto me by you, my ghostly father, or by any of this sacred convent. All which I, A. B., do swear by the blessed Trinity, and blessed sacrament which I now am to receive, to perform and on my part to keep inviolably: and do call all the heavenly and glorious host of heaven to witness these my real intentions to keep this my oath. In testimony hereof I take this most holy and blessed sacrament of the Eucharist, and witness the same further with my hand and seal in the face of this holy convent, this — day of —, A. D. —."

Consistently with the above, Cardinal Manning, in behalf of the pope, makes the following claim: "I claim to be the supreme judge and director of the consciences of men, of the peasant who tills the fields, the prince that sits on the throne, of the household that lives in the shade of privacy, *and the legislature that makes laws for kingdoms. I am the sole last supreme judge of what is right.*"

A writer in *The Advent Review* groups a number of striking facts, showing the tactics of the papacy for regaining supremacy. He says: "Wise for her own interests, the Church of Rome has taken into her own hands the education of youth. In some countries partially, in others entirely, she is training young Europe in the principles of the Syllabus. In France she has a staff of not less than 70,000 persons, male and female, engaged in the work of teaching youth. What are these 70,000 doing but binding down France in the chains of the Syllabus? In Italy and Spain the schools are worked mostly by priests and monks. In Belgium, christian brothers teach the boys, and nuns the girls. In South-

ern Germany, the teachers in the schools are mostly clerical ; it is the same in Austria. Here are millions and millions being reared in the Syllabus, being taught as the truth of God that all merely civil laws and civil rulers, so far as they are not in consonance with popish canon law, are moral nullities, and that the pope is the one God-appointed and divine governor of the earth.

"The generation now being so trained, will soon have the affairs of Europe in their hands. They will be the cabinet ministers of monarchs ; the legislators of kingdoms ; the editors of newspapers ; teachers in colleges and schools ; generals in the army ; and, especially, they will form the rank and file of the soldiery which will fight our future campaigns. It was the schools opened in Germany by the Jesuits that furnished* the soldiers for the Thirty Years' War. The same tactics are being repeated ; and a new generation, trained in the schools, will soon be seen legislating, writing, preaching, and fighting for the suppression of 'Naturalism,' that is, civil liberty, and the subjection of the world to the divine vicegerency of the pope."

If any should conclude that danger from this source does not threaten America, let them ponder the following facts: A Romish priest in this country said to the Rev. Dr. E. G. Brooks, and by him communicated to *The Christian Statesman* of October 30, 1875: "You Americans are committed by your principles to tolerate us ; but we are bound by our principles not to tolerate you, and under the protection of your toleration we are certainly traveling to the time when we will upset toleration, and have everything our own way." *The Shepherd of the Valley*, a Romish paper, made the following declaration (November 22, 1851, and August 6, 1853): "If the Catholics ever gain, which they surely will do, an immense numerical superiority, religious freedom in this country is at an end. So say our enemies, and so we believe." The editor of *The Western Watchman* (St. Louis), "Father" Phelan, says: "Protestantism ! We would draw and quarter it ! We would impale it, and hang it up for crows' nests ! We would tear it with pincers, and fire it with hot irons ! We would fill it with molten lead, and sink it in hell-fire a hundred fathoms deep !" *Tantæ-ne iræ animis celestibus ?*

This is just the logical terminus of their principles. And their boast is, that *they never change*. When we consider their perfect organization, and that the vote of the entire body is always an unit, and that in several States they hold the balance of power, and are courted by all parties, and large sums of money are annually paid to them out of state treasuries, as to an established religion, we see just cause of apprehension. Unprincipled politicians refuse to commit themselves in favor of any reform (such, for instance, as the Bible in our public schools) which, in the most indirect way, implies an opposition to Romish claims. No patriot can countenance, directly or indirectly, a system which is the deadliest enemy to the highest earthly interests of man!

Such was Washington's opinion of popery. The Address to the people of Great Britain, from the delegates appointed by the General Congress, held at Philadelphia in 1774, to represent the grievances of the American colonies, contains the following remarkable paragraph representing their opinion of the dangerous principles of the Church of Rome. The number of delegates was fifty-two, and included the names of Washington, Lee, Chase, Livingston, etc. After complaining of being deprived of trial by jury, of their ports being blockaded, their charters being destroyed, and of an act being passed to protect and indemnify such as might be guilty even of murder in endeavoring to carry their oppressive edicts into execution, the Address goes on to state: "And by another act, the Dominion of Canada is to be so extended, modelled, and governed, as that by being disunited from us and detached from our interests by civil as well as by religious prejudices, that by their members daily travelling with Catholic emigrants from Europe, and by their devotion to an administration so friendly to their religion, they might become formidable to us, and, on occasion, be fit instruments in the hands of power to reduce the ancient free Protestant colonies to the same state of slavery as themselves. . . . They are now the subjects of an arbitrary government, deprived of trial by jury, and where imprisoned cannot claim the *habeas corpus* act, that great bulwark and palladium of English liberty; nor can we suppress our astonishment that a British parliament should ever consent to establish in that country

a religion that has deluged your island in blood, and dispensed impiety, bigotry, persecution, murder and rebellion through every part of the world!"—*The Political Censor or Monthly Review*, Philadelphia, 1796.

Could the Father of his Country have been present again in Philadelphia, September, 1887, at the Centennial of the American Constitution, would he have "suppressed his astonishment" at witnessing the chief of a community of traitors selected to preside over the religious exercises of that august occasion? What emotions of grief and indignation would have overwhelmed him, on beholding the foremost place, with an audacity characteristic of his seditious sect, claimed by and assigned to the representative of "*a religion that has deluged in blood*" many lands, and "*dispensed impiety, bigotry, persecution, murder, and rebellion through every part of the world*"!! This persecutor of church and state, which has shed the blood of fifty millions of martyrs! If this astounding insult offered to the memory of Washington and his fellow-patriots, the illustrious founders of our republic, fail to arouse the American people and cause them to rebuke and thwart the usurpations of a foreign despot, then are they fitted to be his abject slaves! Retributive history will stamp upon the centennial commemoration of the American constitution, as an ineffaceable blot, the name, *Cardinal Gibbons*.

If the proposed "law ordering the expulsion of dangerous aliens" be enacted, as it should be, consistency, justice, public safety require that it should sweep out of America the entire body of the Romish clergy.¹

We have said, that to the writings of John Owen the civilized world is largely indebted for the dissemination of the principles of toleration. But this was in no sense a discovery of his, for even in the writings of the earliest Reformers, notably Zwingle, the principle may be found stated and vindicated with all the clear-

¹ The immortal Milton, "the champion and martyr of English liberty," as well as "the glory of English literature," the bold defender of the freedom of the press, the rights of conscience and the rights of man, gave it as his deliberate opinion, that a christian commonwealth, in consequence of the pope's pretensions to political power and the idolatrous nature of his religious rites, ought not to tolerate his dangerous sect.

ness and force with which Owen has announced it. The Presbyterian Church of Scotland and the Presbyterian Church of Holland were the first, among the churches of the Reformation, to avow and defend the doctrine. Owen was deeply imbued with the spirit of Presbyterianism, and was a diligent student and great admirer of the writings of the learned Rutherford, and declared that he "could readily join with Presbytery as it was exercised in Scotland." The Puritans and Pilgrims, who settled New England, had been nursed in the bosom and had drunk of the spirit of Presbyterian Holland and Geneva before they reached the Rock of Plymouth, and from the first their institutions partook of the Presbyterian form.

The Scottish Bands and Covenants—those imperishable depositories of the principles of ecclesiastical and civil liberty, conservators of the rights of church and state—were both religious and political, ecclesiastical and national, and as such were subscribed by persons of all ranks and qualities, by ministers of the gospel, nobles, barons, gentlemen, burgesses and commons of all sorts. These Bands and Covenants educated the Scotch and Irish settlers of this country in the principles of liberty, and prepared them for the work to which Providence called them, the achievement of American Independence.¹

It was from these Scottish Bands and Covenants, as embraced in Rushworth's Collections, we find that Mr. Jefferson drew largely both sentiments and phrases, as he himself admits. The Hon. Gulian C. Verplanck, of New York, in an address delivered over forty years ago, traced the origin of the Declaration of Independence to the National Covenants of Scotland. And Chief-Justice Tilghman stated that the framers of the American constitution were greatly indebted to the standards of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland. The Hon. William C. Preston said: "It is a most remarkable and singular coincidence, that the constitution of the Presbyterian Church should bear such a close and striking resemblance to the political constitution of our country." The two may be supposed to be formed after the same model. And so, too, we find that a large proportion of the veterans of the Revolution

¹ Mr. Carlyle well observes: "The meaning of the Scotch Covenants was, that God's divine law of the Bible should be put in practice in these nations."

were ministers, officers and members of the Presbyterian Church. James Hall, of North Carolina, assembled his congregation, raised among them a company of cavalry, and took both the command and the chaplaincy. Samuel Houston used his rifle with deadly effect at the battle of Guildford Courthouse. David Caldwell was so conspicuous for his zeal and feared for his influence, that Cornwallis offered a reward of two hundred pounds for his head. These are a few out of many instances of the devotion of the Presbyterian ministry to the cause of their country. Gen. Morgan, who commanded at the Cowpens, was a Presbyterian elder. Gen. Pickens was a Presbyterian elder. Col. Campbell, Col. Williams, Col. Cleaveland, Col. Shelby, Col. Sevier, heroes of King's Mountain, were all Presbyterian elders, and the body of their troops were drawn from Presbyterian settlements. Col. Bratton and Maj. Dickinson were both elders of the Presbyterian church. Maj. Samuel Morrow, who was with Col. Sumpter in four engagements, was for about fifty years a Presbyterian elder. Bishop White states, that during the Revolution "the doors of the far greater number of Episcopal churches were closed for several years." Jacob Douche, an Episcopal minister, was appointed chaplain to Congress in 1776 and officiated for awhile, but he turned traitor to the cause, and wrote a long letter to Gen. Washington urging him to do the same. One Peters, an Episcopal minister, of Connecticut, in the beginning of the Revolution sided with the enemies of his country, and fled from the indignation of his neighbors to England, where this traitor employed his time in preparing and publishing a miserable fabrication, slandering his countrymen and his own ancestors, which he called "The Blue Laws of Connecticut," which some persons confidently believe actually had a place in the statutes of that colony!!

Dr. Inglis, the Tory rector of Trinity church, New York, only did the Presbyterian body simple justice when he wrote in October, 1776: "I do not know one Presbyterian minister, nor have I been able, after strict inquiry, to hear of any who did not, by preaching and every effort in their power, promote all the measures of the Colonial Congress, however extravagant." The Hon. Mr. Read, a distinguished Episcopalian, candidly acknowledges that

“patriotic clergymen of the Established Church were the exceptions, whilst a Presbyterian loyalist was a thing unheard of,” and adds: “The debt of gratitude which independent America owes to the dissenting clergy and laity can never be paid.”

It becomes us to remember ever that an illustrious Presbyterian ancestry, here in this section, applied the principles of their republican church to found their republican state; that in the ancient town of Charlotte, long years ago, a heroic band of Presbyterians planted in that soil the seed of that mighty oak whose wide-spreading branches extend from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and under whose protection all denominations enjoy perfect security, none daring to molest or to make them afraid!

The time-honored Mecklenburg Convention of May 20, 1775, was the offspring of Presbyterianism! One of the historians of North Carolina justly observes: “The principles, the creed of Puritanism, under whose influence human society has so happily been developed, are the principles of civil and religious liberty that struck deep in the soil of Carolina, and sent their vigorous shoots into the valley of the Mississippi.” Of the members of that immortal Convention one was a Presbyterian minister, nine were Presbyterian elders, one of whom, Abraham Alexander, was the chairman, and all were in some way connected with the seven congregations that embraced the whole county of Mecklenburg. They were a band of heroes, who first of all, in the defence of the liberties of their country, “pledged to each other their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor!” They have rendered historic and invested with renown the names of Alexander, Brevard, Davidson, Caldwell, Graham, McDowell, Polk, Avery, Phifer, Reese and Balch.

History justifies the declaration of Mr. Bancroft: “The first voice publicly raised in America to dissolve all connection with Great Britain came, not from the Puritans of New England, nor the Dutch of New York, nor the planters of Virginia, but from the *Scotch-Irish Presbyterians of North Carolina*.”

It was the speech of Dr. John Witherspoon, a Presbyterian minister, president of Princeton College, which decided a wavering Congress to subscribe the Declaration of Independence. When

Congress hesitated to pass the Rubicon, Dr. Witherspoon arose and said: "There is a tide in the affairs of men, a nick of time; we perceive it now before us. To hesitate is to consent to our slavery. That noble instrument upon your table, which insures immortality to its author, should be subscribed to this very morning by every pen in the house. He that will not respond to its accents, and strain every nerve to carry into effect its provisions, is unworthy the name of *freeman*. For my own part, of property I have some, of reputation more. That reputation is staked, that property is pledged, on the issue of this contest. And although these gray hairs must soon descend into the sepulchre, I would infinitely rather they should descend thither by the hands of the public executioner than desert at this crisis the sacred cause of my country!" Such was the appeal which decided that Congress, and ushered into existence the American republic.

And yet there are those who would rob Presbyterianism of its right to its own offspring, and who claim to share the honor and glory of its achievement. Despite the teachings of philosophy, that the civil must follow the spiritual and partake of its genius and form, despite the plain, indisputable facts of history, despite the admissions of the candid and honorable of other denominations, and even of infidels, these luminaries of our day have discovered that the credit is due to no one denomination or class or section or State, but to *the spirit of the age*, to which infidels as well as christians contributed!

This is one of those convenient generalities in which ignorance finds a fancied refuge. What caused *the spirit of the age*, or did it originate uncaused? Thomas Paine himself asserts that "independence was a doctrine scarce and rare, even towards the conclusion of the year 1775." According to Thomas Paine, then, *the spirit of the age* was averse to independence till the close of 1775. And yet Mecklenburg had declared her independence months before! Paine's *Common Sense* was not issued until January, 1776, and was itself the offspring of a suggestion of Dr. Benjamin Rush, who was brought up under the Rev. Samuel Finley, afterwards president of Princeton College. So that what was really valuable in Paine's *Common Sense* was due to *the*

Presbyterian spirit of the age, to which Mecklenburg was the first to contribute seven months before! ¹

No claim has been, nor could be, put forth by the Methodist denomination to a share in originating American Independence. The followers of Mr. Wesley were influenced by him and were obedient to his dictation. Hear his announcement: "All the Methodists there were firm for the government." Dr. Bangs, a Methodist, says of Mr. Wesley's preachers: "They all returned to their native land, except Asbury." And *he*, it was reported, hid among the Tories of Delaware! Will any follower of Mr. Wesley dispute his words? If, then, according to the assertion of one of them, "it was not Presbyterianism, but *the spirit of the age*, that effected independence," how did it happen that *the spirit of the age* did not reach the disciples of Wesley? A more damaging plea could not have been put forth! Wesley's preachers fled the

¹ It has been proved that Paine wrote in defence of American liberty *before* he became an infidel. His "*Common Sense*" and "*Crisis*" constantly appeal to Scripture to sustain their positions. Thus:

"As the exalting one man so greatly above the rest cannot be justified on the equal rights of nature, so neither can it be defended on the authority of Scripture, for the will of the Almighty, as declared by Gideon and the prophet Samuel, expressly disapproves of government by kings."—*Common Sense*.

"We claim brotherhood with every European *christian*, and triumph in the generosity of the sentiment."—*Ibid*.

"As individuals we profess ourselves *christians*."—*Crisis*.

"I look on the various denominations among us to be like children of the same family, differing only in what is called their christian names."—*Common Sense*.

Not until some years later did he avow infidel sentiments. And no word or act of his can be cited in favor of American liberty, or anything else that was good, after he renounced christianity and published his detestable books against the Bible. In 1796 he published a vile effusion, vilifying Washington thus: "As to you, sir, treacherous in private friendship (for so you have been to me, and that in the day of danger), and a hypocrite in public life, the world will be puzzled to decide whether you are an *apostate* or an *impostor*; whether you have abandoned good principles, or whether you ever had any." Addicted to beastly habits, his career ended in poverty, shame and misery. The following epitaph was written for his tombstone while he was yet living:

"Here lies Tom Paine, who ably wrote in
Liberty's defence,
But in his 'Age of Reason' lost his
'Common Sense.'"

country in such haste that *the spirit of the age* could not overtake them!

To Roger Williams and his Baptist associates, it is claimed, belongs, preëminently, the glory of having first on this continent asserted and vindicated the most unlimited principles of civil and religious liberty. Mr. Bancroft says of him: "He was the first person in modern Christendom to assert, in its plenitude, the doctrine of liberty of conscience, the equality of opinions before the law." He has been extolled again and again as a martyr of liberty, his banishment from the colony of Massachusetts (1636 or 1637) being attributed to his devotion to a sacred principle which all good men everywhere now venerate. It is not a pleasant office to spoil a beautiful romance, but the claims of truth require it. And that all this is nothing but a romance, a recent investigation of all the original documents by a distinguished divine of Boston, Dr. Dexter, conclusively shows.

In the first place, Roger Williams's views of the magistrate's power over the bodies and outward state of men only, were not peculiar to him, but were held by men who preceded him and who were every way superior to him, and who held these views without being disturbed; nor was he banished on account of them. But his offenses were these: 1, Proclaiming continually the invalidity of the charter of the colony; that the king's patent was void; that the colonists had no just titles to their lands; that it was a sin to hold them. 2, Proclaiming the unlawfulness of the oath, as being needless to christians and a profanation of the name of God on the part of the unregenerate. He went up and down the colony preaching these seditious doctrines, unsettling the minds of some, and thus doing what he could to undermine the government and subvert the foundations of society. He was repeatedly remonstrated with, but all to no purpose, for although he recanted and professed to be penitent and promised amendment, he broke his promises. He was at length brought to trial for these two crimes, and this it was which procured his sentence of banishment. Respecting his trial, he says: "I acknowledge the particulars were rightly summed up."

In the second place, as to his toleration, "being too tolerant

for the times, etc.," nothing could be further from the fact. He was one of the most intolerant of men. He endeavored to draw off his church from communion with all others, and then refused to commune with his own church because it would not break off communing with all others in the Bay, and refused to commune with his wife because she still attended the meetings at his church. He also taught that it was a sin for women to appear in public, and especially to be present at church, without being veiled. We find that Dr. Cotton Mather, in his *Magnalia*, describes Roger Williams "as a man that had a wind-mill in his head," and speaks of his "quixotism," and represents him as "a preacher that had less light than fire in him."

In the third place, all this occurred whilst Roger Williams was a Congregationalist. More than a year elapsed after his banishment before he joined the Baptists. So that, if any glory belongs to this so-called "martyr of liberty" because of his banishment, this glory of their pet hero Baptists cannot share!

Dr. Mather describes also the disturbances wrought by the Quakers, who declared "the Bible to be the word of the devil," and wrote and published pamphlets "against all earthly powers, parliaments, laws, charters, magistrates and princes," "denying any government to be God's ordinance, but that of those who witness to their light within, and calling every other government, consisting of rulers, judges, justices, lawyers and constables, a tree that must be cut down, for the light alone to rule." "I appeal," says he, "to all the reasonable part of mankind, whether the infant colonies of New England had not cause to guard themselves against these dangerous villains." But yet he does not favor the magistrate's proceeding against them.

This historical investigation, with this survey of the denominations, is made for the purpose of illustrating the principle that civil organizations are moulded by ecclesiastical; that scriptural doctrines can be preserved only by a scriptural polity, which is essential to the freedom of the church; and that the freedom of the church only can secure the freedom of the state. If, then, we claim for Presbyterianism that it is the bulwark of civil and religious liberty, the guardian of man's dearest rights and interests

in the church and state, this is not done in the spirit of vain-glorious boasting over others, but simply because these specified conditions are found in it. The effect follows from the cause. And let it be observed, that what we claim has been freely conceded by those who do not belong to us; yea, the confession has been extorted even from infidels, the bitter foes of christianity. Presbyterianism, embodying the institutions of the gospel more faithfully and fully than any other system, is found profitable for the life that now is, as well as for that which is to come. She spreads her table of privilege and blessing, and invites all freely to partake. But however welcome the guests, none are allowed to insult the host by claiming the entertainment as their own. Although good service was done by some distinguished soldiers and officers not of our communion, yet the movement was Presbyterian as to its origin, inception and successful result. General Washington knew whereof he affirmed, when, in one of the darkest hours of the Revolution, he declared that, if compelled to abandon every other position, he was assured that he could make a final and successful stand among the *Scotch-Irish* of Augusta county, Virginia.

If to the people of Mecklenburg county, N. C., providence assigned the foremost position in the ranks of patriots over a century ago, let them never cease to cherish and to hallow the memory of that illustrious hero who prepared them for it at so great toil and pains, and diligently for years and years sowed the seed that produced the glorious harvest. No ordinary work was given him to do, and no ordinary training and discipline fitted him for it. Deeply imbibing the spirit of the Scottish Covenants, contending earnestly for the "descending obligations" of those Covenants upon all whose ancestors were parties to the same; insisting upon making the adoption of the Solemn League and Covenant a term of communion for church members in the colonies as well as in the mother country; testifying continually to the headship of Christ over the state, and the responsibility of all kings and rulers to him, a failure of whose allegiance to him would forfeit the allegiance of the people to them; proclaiming everywhere these grand old doctrines with a fidelity and a courage and a zeal and a constancy that ought to have secured sympathy and commanded admiration:

instead of this, he experienced the usual fate of those who are in advance of the age. He was opposed, resisted, denounced as an extremist, an ultra reformer, calumniated as an agitator, and even censured by the General Synod of the Presbyterian Church! It was not until he came to North Carolina that he found a congenial element which he could mould and train successfully in devotion to principles, bearing fruit in splendid achievements, the glory of the ages.

To the immortal Craighead, a Presbyterian minister of Ireland, who settled in Mecklenburg in 1766, "the only minister between the Yadkin and the Catawba," who found in North Carolina, what Pennsylvania and Virginia denied him, sympathy with the patriotic views he had been publicly proclaiming since 1741; to this apostle of liberty the people of Mecklenburg are indebted for that training which placed them in the forefront of American patriots and heroes. It was at this fountain that Dr. Ephraim Brevard and his honored associates drew their inspirations of liberty. So diligent and successful was the training of this devoted minister and patriot, so far in advance even of the Presbyterians of every other colony had he carried the people of this and the adjacent counties, that on the very day (May 20, 1775) on which the General Synod of the Presbyterian Church, convened in Philadelphia, issued a pastoral letter to all its churches, counselling them whilst defending their rights by force of arms to stand fast in their allegiance to the British throne, on that day the streets of Charlotte were resounding with the shouts of freemen, *greeting the first Declaration of American Independence!*

A retributive providence, slow but sure, is now vindicating the memory of Christ's faithful witness and his country's greatest benefactor. The names of his detractors have passed into oblivion or have encountered the odium they fastened upon his, but the clouds of prejudice and passion which dimmed his fair fame have all been swept away, and with a glorious lustre, that shall brighten and brighten with the centuries to come, shines forth the honored, thrice-honored, name of ALEXANDER CRAIGHEAD!

Let the people of this and the adjacent counties, as well as his numerous descendants, let the Presbyterian host in these United

States, guard well, as a sacred trust, the elevated principles of this illustrious covenant, the most enlightened, consistent and devoted patriot of the age, justly entitled to the preëminent distinction: "THE *Father of his Country!*" Let them cleave to that ancient faith which is consecrated by the blood of a thousand martyrs! Let them not sacrifice one tittle of their glorious inheritance! Let them stand fast to the altars that are hallowed by the blood of their fathers! Let them stand fast to the sanctuaries that enshrine their honored dust! Let them stand fast to those pure and noble truths of doctrine and of order bequeathed by a heroic ancestry, in which they lived and for which they died! Let them stand fast in all the liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free!

A. W. MILLER.

Charlotte, N. C.

VI. THE PERILS OF EXCESSIVE INDIVIDUALISM.

Republican institutions emphasize the intrinsic dignity of man; representative government illustrates vividly his privileges, independent of all accidents of birth or circumstance; popular suffrage exercises the free and equal rights of all most practically. Such emphasis, illustration, and exercise of personal right, offer opportunity of exaggeration; it cannot be but that in the very nature of these things there must lie the latent possibility of a tendency toward such aggrandizement of personal importance as may, under some circumstances, grow to a dangerous because excessive individualism, a self-assertion aggressive and impatient of restraint.

This inherent tendency has had in the last several decades of our history certain influences eminently favorable to the development of the dangerous results referred to, among which may be mentioned: the unusual enlargement of suffrage; an enlargement in the extent and suddenness of it unprecedented, even the removal of every barrier and limit, the immediate and comprehensive destruction of every restraint and safeguard hitherto thrown around

its exercise, thus opening at once and wide the flood-gates of native ignorance and prejudice, as also of imported vice instinct with rank hate generated and rendered outrageous by the intolerable tyrannies of the old world. This evil, great enough in itself, is aggravated by a wholesale immigration which furnishes the incongruous anomaly of foreign parties in American politics.

Again: consider the wonderful strides of organization, arraying every trade and interest and occupation in battle line for its own protection and advancement, demanding consideration and conciliation; just the very spirit to seize and utilize the opportunity afforded by ignorance, prejudice and vice thus empowered and made exacting by the ballot.

A third such influence exists in the great American institution, the hustings, or popular harangue in the shape of the so-called stump-speech; the detailed canvass which the perfection of party machinery in close competition drives to the necessity of personal solicitation; the closeness of the vote compelling this party machinery to seek out the individual voter and ply him with persuasion; the court and homage thus paid in party exigency to the opinions, sentiments, prejudices even, of the individual, and that, too, irrespective of character; for in such political emergencies and crises the voice and vote of the most illiterate or vicious is as potent practically as that of the wisest and best. Circumstances like these must very greatly enhance the value and exaggerate the importance of personal opinion.

That such a tendency as is latent in the very nature of republican institutions, when favored with such environment as we have just outlined, contains at least the possibility of peril must be evident to any reflecting mind. We fear there are not wanting indications that this individualism has already grown into an excessive self-assertion, an exaggeration of self-importance at present insolent, exacting, aggressive, reckless. Possibly we exaggerate the eminence and imminence of the danger, for it seems to us to contain a menace against all order, business, political, social and religious. It looks toward and longs for a state of society in which the individual will shall be lord supreme of conscience and conduct; under the specious pleas of personal liberty, the seductive sophisms

of free thought and free speech, its real millennium is anarchy, its *Marseillaise* is (*a la* Joseph Cook):

Bring forth a royal diadem,
And crown WHIM Lord of all!

But the foregoing favoring influences form only the occasion and encouragement for such development; the cause we incline to think lies somewhat deeper than all mere incidental circumstances. Our study of the subject has led to some attempt to analyze the character, fix the origin, and trace the progress of the evil. This tentative analysis we shall now give the reader, with no overweening confidence, however, in the correctness of our conclusions or in their value. Moreover, as we shall assuredly lay ourselves liable to the charge of both sectional and sectarian prejudice, we may add that we have no apology to make for our convictions. So far as these are concerned, we content ourselves with a simple but earnest disclaimer of all bitterness toward any section of our common country or any servants of our common Lord.

Older readers may remember a phrase which the recent literature of our late war has rendered familiar to those of us who are yet young, a phrase of frequent occurrence in those bitter days which ushered in the lamentable strife; one of those convenient compact sophisms, epigrammatic in form, proverbial in power, which clothe the doubtful in the garment of praise, suggestive thus of the skill described in the familiar line:

“With names of virtue she deceives.”

We refer to the phrase Higher Law. These words were constantly in the mouth of the new party, a party then insignificant in size and influence, with everything against them—the pulpit, the platform, the press, and law divine and human—as then currently interpreted, North and South alike. Appreciating this fact and its tremendous force, there was laid upon them necessity to nullify its inevitable inhibition over all except a few of the most radical and reckless spirits who were superior to all law, whether letter or spirit. The party proved equal to the occasion; necessity travailed in birth, and sired by the very inspiration of ingenuity this phrase was brought forth. It became at once a watchword, ay, a battle-cry. The Higher Law! higher in nature, more sacred in obli-

gation, superior in sanction to any legislative enactment, any ecclesiastical standard, any interpretation of Scripture. Here was satisfaction for the scrupulous and pretext for the unscrupulous. Under the seeming sacredness of this broad and convenient accommodation, enthused, perhaps even crazed, by this sophism, poor old John Brown could invite a quick and ignominious death by hurling himself, in the very abandon of fanaticism, against the combined force of state and nation. And, strange to say, men of the character and position of Henry Ward Beecher could find justification in lending him material and moral support, aiding and abetting, actually arming him in his confessedly lawless and utterly devilish attempt at a servile insurrection with all its inevitable horrors.

And stranger still; under the sanction of this silly sophism, the poor, miserable fanatic, the violent and defiant breaker of the plainest, most fundamental and necessary law, the expressed statute of every civilized land; tried and executed by the regular and orderly administration of common justice, unquestioned even by his most ardent admirers—this crazy criminal with wholesale murder in his heart has been canonized as a saint, and is to-day worshipped as a martyr by a large portion of the intelligent, law-abiding people of our country!

The explanation of such mortifying anomaly is to be sought in the influence of the higher law theory. It discharged its adherents of all obligation to any law or covenant, statute or standard, that stood in the way. Any such opposition, however grounded, was but "a league with the devil" and "a covenant with hell." Of course, then, the phrase became a very besom of destruction; nothing could withstand its superiority; all law and order, human and divine, must stand aside; the higher law had the right of way. It thus taught man a systematic contempt for that which had always been considered solemn and binding; in so doing it tended to make every man's prejudices and passions his guide; its widespread prevalence and paramount influence wielded a slow but sure power to undermine the very foundations of fidelity, integrity, reverence for law, submission to authority.

Fairy literature tells of a man who released the *genii* from im-

prisonment. We remember to-day the effect of that startling picture upon our childish fancy, as the vague smoky cloud emerged from the narrow opening of the vessel, floating in the air to assume above the shape of a hideous giant ready to destroy the hapless wretch who unwittingly by its release wrought his ruin.

So this hierarchy of fanaticism has evoked a spirit which it cannot exorcise, the spirit of riotous, reckless, personal opinion or prejudice, the *wrong* of private judgment. Having discounted the law, discredited the Scriptures, disapproved the church, in the interests of their "great moral idea," many pupils and followers will do the same in favor of other and immoral ideas. The mass of mankind cannot be expected to pause and discriminate nicely in their application of principles. Teach them the justice of a principle, and the application will be made in any and in all directions that desire dictates.

Consequently this Higher Law theory has brought forth a prolific progeny. One of its offspring—a baptized child, too—is the so-called Christian Consciousness, so potent a factor in the reconstruction of religious thought. Is it not essentially the same thing under a new name and in a different department? Does it not purpose and propose precisely the same results? It claims the authority of last resort, of ultimate appeal, exercises the function of supreme arbiter; ecclesiastical standards and confessions, all systems of theology, interpretations of Scripture, even the very contents of God's Word, all are to be brought before its judgment-seat to be adjusted, corrected, approved, condemned, abrogated, according to its verdict. Certain results of this will appear in the further progress of our discussion; our purpose at present is simply to identify the old thing under this new name. Church covenants, creeds and symbols, with systems of divinity share the same fate at the hands of the Christian Consciousness that the civil constitution and laws met with in dealing with the higher law. Now, what is this Christian Consciousness but the Higher Law theory, exercising itself in the realm of religious truth with the same reckless, lawless license as its forerunner, endeavoring to do for theological thought and ecclesiastical order just what its famous ancestor did for political parties and social order thirty years ago?

Another fostering influence of excessive individualism is suggested by the illustrious name already mentioned, viz., the preaching of a class of leaders of which Henry Ward Beecher was an eminent instance. His admirers have unequivocally claimed his influence as an epoch in theological thought. The glory assigned to him, in our judgment, trenches hard upon a shame; in doing homage to the power of his example they have laid upon him the burden of a great and unenviable responsibility. If their claim shall have been justified, it is questionable whether succeeding generations will bless his memory.

Beecher stemmed no current, but the rather floated on its crest; he was chiefly the eloquent voice of his time, not the moulder of its thought; he did not create public sentiment, though he may have seemed to do so; he discerned, interpreted and justified the tendencies of the time, but he did this with a foresight, a force, an eloquence which constituted him a leader and a master spirit among the influences of his age. The soul and centre of all his doctrine and preaching was in the wake, possibly in the lead, certainly in the company, of the spirit evoked by the Higher Law theory; his eloquence merely fanned the flame that woful torch had lighted in the pride, the prejudice, the passion of man. The inspiring spirit of his whole creed was the very apotheosis of self-will and self-assertion; so dominant this spirit that it pervades all parts of his work like an underlying stratum imbedded in his thought, appearing not only in the highways of his pulpit ministrations, but cropping out in unexpected places, in the wayside saunterings of his leisurely thought, even in the meadows and gardens of his fancy. He lays little stress upon the sovereignty of God as King, his supreme authority as Lawgiver, to be obeyed submissively, unquestioningly; he exhausts his theology along the line of the Fatherhood with touching and eloquent pathos; love rather than law is master; his whole conception of God seems that of an indulgent father towards erratic but gifted and noble children; his gospel accordingly is "the dignity of human nature," and his aim is "reconstructed manhood." There is an ominous absence of emphasis put upon such humbling doctrines as depravity, such homely duties as self-surrender, obedience, and the faith that can

bid the questioning intellect and querulous pride of man, be still; we doubt if a hearer often came away from Plymouth church impressed with the unworthiness, the meanness, the misery of fallen human nature.

The famous preacher was himself an incarnate example of his own teaching, a fateful illustration of its inevitable tendencies. He never bowed his intellect or his nature, imperious both alike, to any humbling word of God or man; proud, self-reliant, self-sufficient, he took his law from his heart and his theology from his taste; he was a law unto himself, a gifted vagrant ruled by the whim of the moment, changing with chameleon-like facility from one kaleidoscopic phase to another of religious and semi-religious thought, until at last only the marvellous genius with which he clothed and embellished his declamation saved him from the naked shame of disgusting infidelity.

In his own case the principle upon which he regulated his course was limited and restrained by the influence of heredity, by the environment of position, by the refinement of good taste, by the instincts of genius, by a heart pure, we hope, amid all indiscretions, and a motive good through all eccentricities of creed and conduct; but transplant the same principle from its environment of Beecher's position, character and circumstances, and you have just the elements for unbridled license of all sorts. So far, therefore, as his influence and example have been a power, so far has he aided the advance of excessive individualism. That he exercised so dominant an influence as his eulogists claim, we are prepared neither to affirm nor deny. He was, however, the conspicuous forerunner of a large and enlarging class who have followed afar in his imperial footsteps, until we are saddened to see traces of this new idea of humanity in many places; in volumes of sermons, ethical and theological discussions in reviews, moral essays in even the lighter periodical literature, together flooding the land like the vermin of Egypt, heralds perhaps of a darkness that may be felt for its thickness.

Coincident and kindred with the personal example and preaching of such leaders, partially perhaps a result of it, we mark another favoring influence in the rise and spread of the Liberal The-

ology. Our reading of this in various quarters has never failed to reveal a constant characteristic common to all the protean variety it assumes, ever identical in all the forms and phases of its shifting shapes; that constant characteristic is Arminianism. Whatever the particular branch of the new theology, whatever its peculiarities, its local, individual, denominational coloring, you will find amid all *differentiæ* one unchanging feature alike in all, viz., it is invariably Arminian. We maintain, moreover, without fear of successful denial, that the essence of Arminianism is entirely on the side of just that view of human nature, its dignity, its power, its righteousness, which gratifies human pride, which begets self-sufficiency, which nourishes self-will and self-assertion and hence must infallibly foster the individualism that forms the tap-root of these evils that spread their baneful branches around us.

Now, study at your leisure the deliverances of this broad theology in the light of the foregoing charge. You shall notice that it never fails to fight bitterly every distinctive tenet of Calvinism, that it is always allied with Arminianism in all differences between these two great opposing systems. This much in general. You shall notice more specifically a direct denial of all the most humbling doctrines of the nature and condition of man, an emasculation of the character of God, a lowering and lessening of the authority of the Holy Scriptures even to the virtual nullification of any supreme and infallible standard, a pervading spirit of compromise and concession to the pride and the prejudice of man, a universal adjustment and reconstruction along the line of rationalism, an amazing wildness and unbridled license of speculation. It lacks conspicuously that reverent submission to God and God's revealed will, that is so decided and constant a characteristic of Calvinism, and consequently it puts no break-water of a "Thus saith the Lord," before the advancing tide of human speculation; it has no "Thus far shalt thou come and no farther," with which to rebuke the encroaching insolence of rationalism; it does not lay man's pride of intellect and rebellion of will and perverse passionate hardness of heart humble and submissive in the very dust before God. On the contrary, it tends to make man abundantly satisfied with himself, to exalt and inflate his pride. In its last analysis

and cumulative effect it leads up to making each individual, his own prejudices, sentiments, views and opinions, the ultimate arbiter of every question. The final result is that a man's conscience, judgment and feelings combined, become practically his guide and his God.

Now, it is entirely possible that some readers may inquire somewhat sceptically, if not scornfully, into the bearing of all this upon the tendencies of our times. Some of it is far away, and most of it high up in the hazy realm of theory, far above the practical doings of man, aloft in the cold abstractions of theology, in the clouds of speculation. But in these regions is born the whirlwind, from these clouds drops the thunderbolt. The man whose farm is enriched or ruined by the river, has no thought or concern for the spring afar and aloft, but it is none the less, however, the source of his blessing or his blight.

Let us see: We have unbridled license of private opinion and free thought, *i. e.*, freedom to entertain whatever opinion a man pleases about God, heaven, hell, man, his duty, his destiny; freedom to think just whatever he chooses. He has lost his reverence for the authority of God, for the inspired Word of God as man's guide, teaching him what man is to believe concerning God, and what duty God requireth of man. The necessary result is a general lowering of reverence, a self-sufficiency and arrogance of opinion that renders him resentful against interference, impatient of restraint, scornful of correction, contemptuous of authority. If any man is so fatuous as to infer no practical result from such anarchy in the mind and heart, he is beyond the reach of reason. True, this movement is made under the standard of free thought and free speech, but does the banner hoisted over a host alter the character of the revolution wrought? Call it by whatever specious, even holy, name you please, it cannot be either right or safe for a man to think incorrectly, unjustly, unrighteously, irreverently.

An authority somewhat archaic with these free thought advocates, but as philosophic as it is orthodox, has said, "As a man thinketh in his heart so is he," and we shall assuredly find society much affected by this riot in the realm of thought.

Given this alleged license under claim of free thought, and

the next step is demand for a like license in the name of free speech; the inevitable drift of unbridled speculation is toward unreserved expression of opinion, and when that opinion is the dictate of an overweening confidence and self-sufficient pride of intellect, free speech presses its claims *pari passu* with free thought. If a man has the right to cherish whatever opinion he chooses, he very naturally insists on the untrammelled advocacy of that opinion. Accordingly, in the leading periodical of the United States, we hear Colonel Robert G. Ingersoll say to Dr. Henry M. Field:

"The question then is, not have we the right to think—that being a necessity—but have we the right to express our honest thoughts. You certainly have the right to express yours, and you have exercised that right. Some of your brethren, who regard me as a monster, have expressed theirs. The question now is, have I the right to express mine? In other words, have I the right to answer your letter? To make that a crime in me which is a virtue in you, certainly comes within your definition of superstition. To exercise a right yourself which you deny to me is simply the act of a tyrant. Where did you get your right to express your honest thoughts? When, and where, and how did I lose mine?"

The claim sounds only just, indeed it rings almost like a truism; but then Spies, Parsons, Fielden & Co. made precisely the same claim for their "honest thoughts;" they were doubtless fully as sincere in holding and advocating their opinions as Colonel Ingersoll is. They claimed and exercised the right to express their honest thoughts, but the law claimed and exercised the right to break their necks, and the law-abiding people of the land said, Amen.

Is it not evident abundantly that this so-called right has been carried to the last limit endurable? Are we not already reaping a harvest of dragon's teeth in the crude, callow, flippant, irreverent, even blasphemous, "honest thoughts" sown broadcast in our homes, contaminating almost every branch of literature? When crazy enthusiasts claim the privilege of preaching a crusade against all order and decency, has not the right been exaggerated into a wrong, rampant, ruinous to the peace and prosperity of our country?

Unbridled license in thought and speech lead infallibly to the same in conduct. If a man exercises the right to think and speak as he pleases, he will soon demand to do as he pleases. And why

not? His honest thought claims to be heard, and by the same and equal right it claims to be done. The whole purpose of earnest, honest thought (and we refer to none other in this discussion) is earnest, honest deed. Has a man the right to justify and advocate any course of conduct that he has not a right to pursue? If he is free to stand on a goods-box in the public street and appeal to my prejudice, inflame my discontent, impose on my ignorance, incite and persuade to crime by pleading, defending, justifying his cause; if he is free to drive his "honest convictions" into me, to sear them on brain and heart with maddening power, have I any the less right to act out these same honest convictions that dominate my soul and conscience as with the very possession of the devil? Common sense, common justice, common equity agree in holding the instigator even guiltier than his puppet, the perpetrator of the crime. All this is plain and simple enough, but *ex uno disce omnes*. The same is true of all loose, wild license of thought and speech; the evils may not be so patent because not so gross, but they may be none the less dangerous and productive of injury when their silent growth shall have finished its fruitage. Is proof asked? It shall be forthcoming.

Occasionally we are confronted with a claim, on the part of preachers of the gospel, to retain positions of influence and emolument in a church with the creed of which they are no longer in accord, nay, verily, but on the contrary in conspicuous and clamorous discord; they assert and maintain the right to assail the distinctive doctrines of a denomination under the sacred *imprimatur* of its own authority; and not only so, but even sustained and supported by its own stipend. Such a course, we confess, in our opinion rises little above the grade of vulgar treachery; yet we see reputable writers in standard periodicals peremptorily claiming, and laboriously defending, the right of such dissidents so to do; basing such claim and defense on the sacred privilege of free thought and free speech, commending the treachery for its candor and boldness, and supporting their outrageous claims by the sweeping and slanderous assertion that these troublers of Israel are only more outspoken than their more conservative because more timid brethren. Does this statement savor of exaggeration? Read the

following extract from an editorial of perhaps the most popular and widely circulated magazine in our country, in which the editor delivers himself in behalf of a minister who had been suspended for promulgating views patently contradictory to the creed of the church which commissioned and stood responsible for him :

“Every such case as his brings up the fact that the confession is subscribed to by every one in a more or less Pickwickian sense. Just how far the Pickwickian quality in the subscription may be allowed to go has to be determined anew each time according to the temper of the judges. The truth is, the whole system of subscription is a scandal to christian honesty. It is a disgrace to any church—and in this matter the Presbyterian Church is no worse than most of the others—to require its ministers to formally assent to an elaborate creed some part of which every one of them in his heart disbelieves. It is not now a question of sound theology; it is a question of personal honesty. The Westminster Confession may every word of it be true, if you please; none the less is it a shame to religion to ask men who do not believe it to say they do believe it. In effect, the church does not require or expect a genuine belief in all her articles from her ministers; she exacts only a pretence of belief, understood by every one to be a mere sham. If the great Presbyterian Church of America were bravely to renounce the time-honored lie, it would be the best day in her history. While the present system stands, with its admitted uncertainties and duplicities and pitfalls for christian conscience, it must be a question for the judges in every ecclesiastical case like Mr. —’s, just what degree of manfully avowed dissent from a confession of which nobody believes the whole, disqualifies a man for the ministry which owns Christ as its Master?”

Without pausing to mark the glaring inconsistency and rich absurdity generally of this oracular deliverance, we emphasize the moral blindness involved in it.

The religious world has been recently startled by what will pass into history as the Andover Case, the gist of which is simply this: the faculty of Andover Theological Seminary is required individually to subscribe a creed which the seminary was founded to teach and support; so cautious were the founders that they made this subscription renewable every five years, in order the more scrupulously and carefully to guard the orthodoxy of the institution and the fidelity of its faculty. Now, it is notorious that its present professors are out of harmony with this creed. They publish under the name and auspices of the seminary a *Review*, devoted mainly to the maintenance and spread of doctrines not only diverse from, but diametrically opposite to, those of the Andover creed. The authorities of the semi-

nary have expressly so declared, and yet these teachers of the teachers refuse to surrender their places. Not only are they willing, but they demand to sign the creed and have actually appealed from the government of the seminary to the civil law to sustain them in this demand. This wrong they perpetrate in the name of free thought. In the interests of liberty of conscience this manifest malfeasance, this high-handed outrage is sought to be justified.

An additional development of this same controversy has brought about the now celebrated wrangle in the venerable American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. One phase of the aforementioned doctrinal eccentricities is the theory of probation after death. This same dissident party demand that men holding this heresy be commissioned and supported as foreign missionaries by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. And they offend high heaven with an unseemly clamor because the heretical vagaries of a beggarly minority are not recognized by the guardians of the work and supported by the money which christian liberality contributes for the express purpose of teaching the contrary.

Our readers will readily recognize the fact that in each of the three foregoing instances the "liberal" men are not fighting for liberty of conscience, but for such liberty *plus* their positions. They are demanding to proclaim by the authority, in the name, and through the support, both moral and financial, of the church, doctrines which the church disapproves. The fight is not for the right of free thought. Not at all. The fight is simply for the wrong of forcing others who differ from them to sustain and support their views. They are seeking in each respective instance to compel the perversion of trust funds and trust positions. Mark it: This is not a question of the soundness of their views on the matters in dissent. Grant that they are correct in their views, yet this does not give them the right to force the support of those views on others who repudiate them. This is an achievement of free thought and liberty of conscience quite peculiar!

Another instance of the peculiar pranks played by this high-strung freedom in practical affairs, is furnished by the "Personal Liberty Leagues." This is a sort of saloon and anti-Sabbath asso-

ciation. They are banded together for the abolition of legal regulations and police restrictions.

The importance of Sabbath observance may be inferred from the universal effort making in all the various denominations towards a stricter Sabbath. Just when committees, special and standing, under appointment by the different churches, are inviting coöperation in a united effort on the State legislatures for more stringent laws, feeling that this lies at the source of a healthful moral and spiritual life of our people, that the nullification of Sabbath sanctity is but the beginning of a sweeping revolution that would take away all recognition of a divine obligation in human affairs and bring a swift declension in all that is good; just at this juncture, we are met with the charge that even such laws as we have are a tyranny not to be endured by a free people. In the name of freedom the right to open the marts of trade and places of amusement is claimed. The dance-hall and the church, the bar-room and the Sabbath-school must have equal rights and fair competition on what America has been wont to call the Lord's day. And one of these banded leaguers, waxing bold, declares that he would vote for the devil if he would bring it about; which they both would no doubt be glad to do.

These leagues are organized for active, aggressive work. They are moving in large masses and with perfect system to attack the sanctity of our Sabbath and the peace of our homes, and, lo! this revolution, like the others, advances under the very same banner, viz., free thought and liberty of conscience, as witness the following:

"Something has to be done to remove the oppression resting upon us. [The speaker read various sections of law as passed by different Legislatures, but dwelling especially on the law of 1794.] I ask you, gentlemen, has anybody the right, from a moral point of view, to offer us any thing like that for our Sundays? Were this land a declared christian nation there would be at least the right and excuse for the execution of such, but our Constitution does not say a word like that, and in our country everybody can seek his own salvation according to his own methods.

"The ministers declare that these laws existed here before we came to the country, and if they did not suit us, we could return to where we came from. The native-born possess no more rights than the naturalized citizen who voluntarily comes to this country. I ask you, gentlemen, shall such laws be longer executed?"

The most signal instance of this spirit of excessive individualism we have reserved for the last, viz., Anarchism, as it is called. This is so diabolic in nature and motive and method as to seem almost independent and original in wickedness. We cannot see that it is, however; it falls into line with what has just been gone over; it is only a logical and natural, though very decided, development of exactly the same principles that underlie the more moderate movements hitherto discussed. The violent anarchist, socialist, communist simply carries into actual conduct the creed he has been taught by the arguments of the more decent advocates of free thought and free speech.

Make a man a law unto himself in his opinions, assert and defend his liberty of conscience to believe whatever he chooses provided only he is sincere, constitute his feelings and prejudices the supreme arbiter of right and wrong, destroy his submission to the authority of God, his reverence for the inspired Word, and you have made him superior to the sanctions of so sacred an influence as religious belief, will you now expect him to be amenable to lesser obligations?

If the statutes of the Almighty are made subordinate, subservient even, to the man's private prejudices, what reverence can be expected for the statutes of a legislature? If he adjusts the law of God according to the dictates of his own preference, will the law of man fare better? Lessen his sense of honor in the discharge of fidelity to trusts moral and financial, teach him to justify himself in the plain perversion of trust funds, to defeat the express will of the contributors in the face of their emphatic protest, and can you hope to see him maintain his respect for property rights in general? When men of refined culture, of high place even in the church, can be so dull to a nice sense of honor, is it to be supposed that the ignorant, the prejudiced, the vicious, the needy will be more scrupulous in sensibility? Ah! no; men never yet gathered grapes of thorns or figs of thistles. Sanctify unfaithfulness to church covenants by the title of Christian Consciousness, dignify the passion of prejudice by the sacred and powerful name of "the Higher Law," and under such names and claims preach a holy crusade against the statutes of state and church, and you are unwittingly paving the way for the

“great unwashed” to follow with their application of the same principles.

The nation is horrified to hear Fielden in Chicago incite to murder and massacre by saying:

“It is quite true that we have lots of explosives and dynamite in our possession, and we will not hesitate to use it when the proper time comes. We care nothing either for the military or the police, for these are in the pay of the capitalist. We are told that we must attain our ends and aims by obeying law and order. Damn law and order! We have obeyed law and order long enough. The time has come for you, men, to strangle the law, or the law will strangle you.”

But what is this “damn law and order” but the echo of that same “higher law” theory? What is it except a low and coarse, but entirely consistent, application of the identical principle espoused, defended, glorified by so many when they maintained that their own ideas of right and wrong were superior to the laws of the land, and being so, discharged their conscience of obligation thereto? In Fielden’s “honest judgment” the capitalist is a criminal, a tyrant fattening on the starved labor of the poor. The whole system of law is in unholy alliance with this injustice and oppression. How suggestive would have been the historic words, “a league with the devil” and “a covenant with hell”! Such being the “honest conviction” of the anarchist, he has high authority for his right to hold, advocate, defend, propagate it. We hear him exercise it. While his condemned brethren are awaiting the execution of the death sentence, Herr Most harangues the brotherhood in New York:

“Do they think we are going to remain quiet and allow our friends to die an ignominious death? You cannot allow that hanging to take place. Arm yourselves, and for every drop of blood that is shed from our friends let it cost a human life. I am not alone an Anarchist, but also a Revolutionist. The capitalists shall be the first to suffer. No one shall escape his just dues. The twelve jurors, judges and detective spies will not sleep very soundly at present. Let them beware. [Wild yells and cheers from the crowd.] As Anarchists, we have no respect for these laws by which our brothers die. As Revolutionists, we are fearless. The day will come when we will be forced to use fire-arms.”

At the funeral of the men hanged for the horrible slaughter of the officers of the law while engaged in the performance of their sworn duty, we hear the same spirit speak:

“With grief and shame my eyes look down into these graves,” he said, his teeth almost clinched. “I could tear my flesh in agony when I behold how the workmen have allowed this manifold, outrageous and diabolical murder. I have

spoken to you since these heroes were dragged into a hell upon earth by the capitalistic monsters and demanded of you if you would allow this terrible outrage. You then all shouted in unison, 'No!' 'No!' 'No!' Shame! Shame upon you that you have eaten your words, and, like weaklings, allowed your best and most heroic champions to be sacrificed. I term you cowards. Cowards, to allow the noblest men in your ranks to be butchered in cold blood and never rise in their defense. [Loud and continuous applause and howls of rage.] Are you united now? Are you strong and firm for one united purpose? Revenge! [Here somebody touched Currilin's arm and made a motion to him.] Revenge! I say. Revenge in a humane way. Mr. Morgan has talked to you of the power of the ballot and has told you to use it for your relief, but in spite of the ballot we are enslaved and down-trodden. Be men! [Tumultuous applause.] Fulfil the legacy of your martyrs. Devote all your energy to the task of avenging the crime committed. The ballot—pshaw! Despite the ballot these four were strangled. Join hands and let us all fight, and if necessary die for liberty. Let justice be done in fullest measure to the memory of our noble martyrs." [Great applause.]

Such language makes the ears tingle and society rises in wrath and horror to hush it within the walls of a prison or strangle it with a hangman's noose. Horrible as it is, it is but a logical result, a natural consequence, a legitimate harvest of seed sown long before; seed of very slow, but very sure growth, with a distant but certain fruitage.

It is our firm conviction that there is in all these various disturbing elements a close kinship, a common thread connecting all the developments of anarchy, in thought, in speech and in conduct. To reveal such kinship, to trace this thread has been the purpose of our paper; our conclusion is that when we view the lawless, devilish violence that startles our land, we do but stand by the turbid torrent that takes its rise in those calm, clear, cold heights of abstract thinking which seem so far from the practical concerns of everyday life. Limited and restrained by the environment of its advocates it seems at worst a harmless vagary, an innocuous eccentricity; but such principles percolate downward, and gathering the soil of impure souls, they become so foul that the spring is not recognized in the stream. Principles are powerful; ethical and moral, and preëminently theological, principles are productive of practical results; they lie at the bottom of all great social and political disturbances; they furnish the motive power of the revolutions that wreck society. A false principle is a child of the devil, and is in every stage of it an enemy of God and man.

SAMUEL M. SMITH.

VII. NOTES.

CHRISTIAN GIVING, OR ECCLESIASTICAL MERCHANTISING?

One of the first acts of our Lord's public ministry was his purification of the temple. He found there "those that sold oxen and sheep and doves, and the changers of money sitting: and he drove them all out of the temple, and the sheep and the oxen; and poured out the changers' money, and overthrew the tables; and said unto them that sold doves, Take these things hence; make not my Father's house a house of merchandise. And his disciples remembered that it was written, The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up." Again, near the close of his ministry he repeated those vigorous measures for the purification of his Father's holy sanctuary; and he said unto the money changers, etc., "It is written, My house shall be called a house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of thieves."

What was the nature of those abuses which our Saviour thus summarily rebuked and sought to abolish? At the passover multitudes of pious Jews flocked to Jerusalem, to join in the feast and to make their yearly offerings. The animals necessary for their sacrifices they bought in the city, and the Jewish shekels for the temple offerings they obtained in exchange for their foreign coin. Cattle dealers, money changers, etc., had, for the sake of driving bargains with these visitors, set up their stands in the very court of the temple itself. These men probably defended their traffic by alleging (what was perfectly true) that it was an honest business when not abused by being carried to extortion, and that being for the accommodation of God's worshippers, it was for the promotion of spiritual ends. What was there, then, in that traffic, apart from the extortion practiced, that excited our Saviour's indignant remonstrance? It was simply this: The desecration of God's sacred temple by using it as a house of merchandise, the devoting to carnal uses of that which was intended for spiritual purposes solely. Our Lord here enounced the general principle that the church is a spiritual institution, designed for spiritual ends, to be conducted on spiritual principles, and to be surrounded by spiritual associations. Even her houses of worship should be kept free from all secular transactions.

Have we to-day no lesson to learn from these words and actions of our Master? Do we conduct all our church enterprises strictly on the principles laid down in God's Word? Are our church buildings devoted to no uses but those connected immediately with God's worship? As to the latter question: What of all those concerts, sociables, Christmas trees, etc., which are so often held in the very house of God "where prayer is wont to be made"? Even material objects can exert a great deal of moral influence over us from their associations. To the wanderer returning home after years of absence, every object that meets his gaze, every chair and table and picture and book, speaks to him of by-gone days, and recalls vividly "the old familiar faces." So those walls that have been wont to echo no sounds but those of Christ and his salvation will ever seem to re-echo in our ears the sweet old refrain; while the house in which solemn religious services are interspersed with gay concerts and festivals will ever produce in our minds a sad confusion of things spiritual and things carnal.

And now as to the first question asked: Do we conduct all our ecclesiastical business on strictly spiritual principles? What about our methods of raising money for the Lord's service—our church fairs, concerts, suppers, dine parties, etc.? From a secular standpoint they are perfectly legitimate business transactions; and so was that temple traffic. They are for the express purpose of promoting spiritual ends; and so was that other business that provoked our Lord to wrath. But are they the spiritual methods which God has appointed in his Word for the financial maintenance of his church? Where has he ever directed the church to turn merchant and carry on a business of buying and selling for her own support? The only method of church support enjoined in the Bible and practiced in all dispensations is by the free-will offerings of God's people. The church has always been kept in a state of absolute dependence upon the good will of her members. Nowhere in the Bible is she represented as receiving a certain stock of goods from her friends, and then starting out in business for herself, setting up her tables and advertising her trade. The nearest approach to this ecclesiastical trading practice we can find in Scripture illustrates well the difference between the divinely approved method and our nineteenth century plan: "As many as were possessors of houses or lands sold them and brought the prices of the things that were sold and laid them down at the apostles' feet." Now that is just what all properly-conducted ladies' sewing societies do. They make their articles out of their own materials, sell them privately in their own names, and then turn over to the church the proceeds, which belong to no one but

themselves—quite a different thing from our ecclesiastical suppers and concerts. I know that some of the advocates of such things claim that it is not the church that conducts these enterprises, but private members, who thus by their honest labor make their own money and turn it over to the church as a free-will offering. But why then do we call them *church* concerts and sociables; why publish them as such in the papers; why carry on the whole affair under the auspices of the church; why make this an inducement to our patrons to trade with us, and why call upon all good church members as in duty bound to join in these *church* enterprises? It is sometimes, if not generally, the case that ministers even announce these things from the pulpit among their regular church notices. Think of it! Interrupting God's service to talk about concerts and suppers and Christmas trees and pic-nics! Their own money, indeed! Free-will offering to the church! Where is the person who is not a rogue that would dare keep back one cent of money thus acquired from the church? I think it is sufficiently evident that in such transactions the church is made to play no other part than that of a merchant, transacting worldly business like any other secular corporation. Those who manage the affair are but her agents, and all they make belongs properly to her as a matter not of grace but of debt. For them to retain any of the proceeds for their private use would be just as honest as it is for the clerk to despoil his employer's till.

And what kind of a business is this in which the church is made to engage? It seems strange that those who would think it beneath them to turn peddlers, restaurant-keepers, etc., yet think they are honoring the church in thus degrading her. What a state our poor church must be in when she is forced to take to selling oysters and ice-cream for a living! What minister with an atom of self-respect would tolerate a proposal to raise his salary in such a way? But why not? Are we better than God? If it be no dishonor to him to maintain the general benevolent causes of his church by the proceeds of such transactions, why should we feel ashamed to be supported in the same way?

Having seen that these things violate the general principle of the spirituality of the church, let us now examine some of the principles of christian giving as contained in God's word, and see how these practices accord with them :

1. We are directed to make our gifts as unostentatiously as possible. "Let him that giveth do it with simplicity;" "Take heed that ye do not your alms before men to be seen of them, otherwise ye have no reward of your Father which is in heaven. Therefore when thou doest

thine alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee." That is to say, do not advertise in all the newspapers how hard the good ladies of such and such a church are working to raise money for an organ or carpet; and when the affair is over do not proclaim with a flourish the success that has crowned your indefatigable efforts, and what a splendid sum you have turned over to the church. But go, sell that ye have, the very coat off your back if need be, and then bring your money and modestly drop it into the collection bag.

2. In giving to the church we should be actuated by one motive solely, love to Christ. "Whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink in my name, because ye belong to Christ, verily I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward." Paul exhorts the Corinthians to liberality "to prove the sincerity of their love." And he further incites them by reminding them of Christ's self-denial on their behalf: "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich." The one feeling, then, that should actuate us in giving to the Lord is gratitude to him for his unspeakable gift to us. Any other motive entering in only vitiates our gift. As soon as we begin to entertain ideas of self-gratification, then our gift ceases to be an expression of love and gratitude to God, and so far from being "an odor of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God," it becomes a stench in his nostrils, an abomination in his sight. What a wrong are we committing, then, when we not only commit this fault ourselves, but teach others, whether directly or indirectly, so to do. And it does not help the case at all to allege that the only givers to the church in these entertainments are those who manage them, and that none others are taught to regard themselves as such. For, in the first place, why then do we urge men to patronize us on the plea that they are thus doing the Lord's service? And, in the second place, you cannot get men to make any such fine discrimination. They will, and very naturally, regard themselves as patrons not only of those private agents of the church, but of the church herself. The fact is, it is only by thus representing the matter that these entertainments are so successful. Thus we encourage men to give their money with the two-fold object of gratifying themselves and of serving the Lord, a half-hearted kind of service which God will by no means accept. It is like the motley worship of the old Samaritans, "they feared Jehovah, and served their own gods."

The practical result, moreover, of all this is that we obscure in men's minds the gospel principle of freely giving to God and trusting him for the reward, temporal and spiritual, and teach them to give

only when they may expect a good material equivalent immediately in return.

3. A great object in christian liberality should be the glory of God. "The administration of this service not only supplieth the wants of the saints, but is abundant also by many thanksgivings unto God, while by the experiment of this ministration they glorify God for your professed subjection unto the gospel of Christ, and for your liberal distribution unto them." But these church entertainments, so far from glorifying God and being an honor to the church, do but make the latter a laughing-stock before the world, when men see to what shifts she must resort for a living. It is a declaration to the world either that the grace of God is not efficacious enough to persuade his people to support his church by their own free-will offerings, or that he is not able to accomplish his work with those gifts, and therefore we must beg the world to help him out with more.

4. This giving of our substance to the Lord in token of gratitude and love to him, and the self-denial which attends it, is the exercise of a christian grace. Paul speaks of "the grace of God bestowed on the churches of Macedonia; how that in a great trial of affliction the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality." "Therefore," says he to the Corinthians, "as ye abound in everything, in faith and utterance and knowledge and in all diligence, see that ye abound in this grace also." Now amid all the bustle and frolicking of a church festival, how much of the devotional spirit can be cultivated? When even the managers of the affair go into it frequently as much as a matter of fun as anything else, how much of that worshipful and self-denying spirit to which Christ attaches all importance do they exercise?

Moreover, the very fundamental idea which underlies this business is a totally false one, namely, that the more money we can rake and scrape together for the Lord the better, irrespective of the way in which it is gotten, so it be an honest one. Why does God intrust the management of his earthly kingdom to the church? Could he not convert every sinner without her aid? Why does he make the spread of the gospel to depend, in a certain sense, upon her gifts? Does he really need her wealth? He calls every beast of the forest his, and the cattle upon a thousand hills. "If I were hungry I would not tell thee, for the world is mine, and the fulness thereof." Why, then, does he make use of our agency, but that he would have us exercise the graces of christian working and christian giving? What God really wants is not our money and our labor for their own sake, but the faithful worship and ser-

vice of his people. "Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." God respects, then, not the absolute amount of our gifts, but the spirit which prompts them. "Jesus beheld how the people cast money into the treasury: and many that were rich cast in much. And a certain poor widow threw in two mites. And he saith unto his disciples, This poor widow hath cast more in than all they." "For if there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not." We may well apply to ourselves the rebuke which God administered to Israel of old for a similar reason: "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord. I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts. Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me."

This illegitimate mode of raising money for the Lord is destroying the grace of christian liberality in the church, and cultivating a selfish spirit in the hearts of God's people. Even those who applaud themselves as being so zealous for the Lord in getting up such enterprises oftentimes do the work, I fear, because it is much easier and pleasanter than denying ourselves of our own possessions. And we are becoming so accustomed to these methods that no sooner is some church improvement, for instance, proposed, than some one, instead of putting his hand into his pocket, as the Lord asks him to do, suggests that the ladies get up a church entertainment. The consequence is that the burden of supporting the church is being more and more imposed upon the women and children, while the men, who have the money and whose business it is to take care of their wives' and children's spiritual as well as temporal interests, look on and do nothing.

5. God promises that if his people give faithfully, according to the measure of their ability, he will prosper them more and more, and so enable them to increase their bounty and thus supply all the needs of the church. He "is able to make all grace abound toward you, that ye, always having all sufficiency in all things, may abound to every good work: being enriched in everything to all bountifulness." But we are not always willing to take God at his word; unless we resort to some other plan for supporting the church than the old-fashioned one of simply laying by in store for her as the Lord hath prospered us, we cannot see how we shall build our new church, or repair the old one, or get us a carpet or an organ. Is not a wicked unbelief, then, largely

at the bottom of this whole business, a want of confidence in our heavenly Father?

Thus we have examined various principles of christian giving, and testing these methods of church support by them, have found such methods inconsistent with them all.

And what good is derived from such things, even from a purely financial standpoint? The advocates of these schemes claim that large sums of money are thereby turned into the treasury of the Lord. But what shall we say of the large sums kept out of the Lord's treasury? The more we resort to such practices for making money illegitimately, the less will we be at pains to give to the church in the legitimate way; and thus as this ecclesiastical traffic increases, in about direct ratio will the free-will offerings of God's people decrease. This will inevitably be the case as long as human nature is what it is.

The fact is, if all God's people did their duty in the matter of giving, there would be no necessity for such schemes. This, I think, all must acknowledge. These practices arise from an evil existing in the church, namely, the selfishness of God's people. There are one of two courses open to us, either to indulge this selfish spirit by getting money in other ways than by direct appeal to church members, or to let these members see that the church is suffering through their neglect, and persuade them to cultivate the grace of liberality. Which course shall we adopt? Ask any sensible physician what he does with a patient, one of the organs of whose body is not performing its natural functions. Does he resort to artificial means to get that work done in the physical system, and meanwhile leave the diseased member to die through inactivity, or does he try to stimulate it to healthy exercise, and so enable it to recover its full vigor? It is never judicious to resort to any temporising measures which only aggravate and perpetuate an evil.

These practices are something peculiar, I believe, to this radical, worldly-wise nineteenth century, which is never content to walk in the old paths, where is the good way, but is ever concocting new and so-called practical schemes. This is the age of electricity and railroads. Everything, to please us, must be done in the twinkling of an eye. Physicians are curing all sorts of diseases by electricity; why may we not carry a similar cure into the spiritual world, and by turning upon the poor sinner the galvanic battery of spurious religious excitement, startle him in a moment from his spiritual torpor and shock him into the kingdom of heaven? We carry nearly everything now by steam; why not railroad our church along on the backs of all kinds of financial schemes? The church has to learn again and again the same old les-

son that God's ways are not our ways, and that his ways are the wisest and best. We may depend on it, he is not going to bless these faithless, self-asserting schemes of ours. He can multiply, if he will, a few loaves and fishes to feed a multitude; and again, all our wealth and power will avail naught without his blessing. And so it is with our church just now; with all our dime readings, ice cream festivals, oyster suppers, concerts, etc., etc., every one of the benevolent causes of the church is languishing for the want of a proper support. May God, who "is able to make all grace abound toward us," grant us more fully that old Macedonian grace of christian liberality, and that, "always having all sufficiency in all things, we may abound to every good work."

E. C. MURRAY.

EVANGELISM: ITS PLACE, AND HOW IT SHOULD BE PROMOTED.

It is the claim of Presbyterians, while crediting other denominations with many excellencies, that their church government is in beautiful harmony with the spirit of the nineteenth century and the genius of American institutions. In fact, our national government is largely moulded after the pattern of that of the Presbyterian Church, with its two kinds of officers in representative assemblies, and with a series of appellate courts. Our theological system is not only thought to be in closest accord with the entire Word of God, but also in true harmony with the laws of the most advanced science. Again, we claim large catholicity of spirit, while adhering to the most rigid doctrinal standards ourselves, receiving to church fellowship and to the communion table members coming from any of the evangelical denominations. This much is said not by way of boasting, but to emphasize the following thoughts.

Notwithstanding all this, and our age as a church, we have increased far less rapidly than some other denominations. It is claimed, with justice, perhaps, that the Presbyterian Church is more rigid in the admission of members than some denominations. But there are other denominations who also are careful to receive only such as give evidence of regeneration, and yet they have outgrown us. With doctrinal and ecclesiastical advantages on our side, there must be some fault, and no small one either, somewhere in our system or polity. It behoves us to seek it out. One cause, no doubt, is the paucity of our ministry. But this is not the point at issue just now. It may be claimed

that our ministry excel most others in culture and scholarship. I do not care to discuss here the vexed question as to whether men may not be cultivated out of full sympathy with the physical, social and mental condition of the masses from whom most of the harvest is to be expected. "For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh," etc. (1 Cor. i. 26). But the point to which a careful consideration is invited is this: *The fundamental mistake as to the evangelistic office in the church.*

The old Form of Government says: "The pastoral office is the first in the church both for dignity and usefulness." And while the revised "Book of Church Order" in the South says that the *ministry* is the first in importance, it virtually sustains the relative importance of the two offices by defining that of the pastor first, and the estimate set on the pastorate in the actual working of the church sustains this view.

This reverses the order of God's Word, and of law, or logic. God says: "He gave some apostles and some prophets; and some evangelists and some pastors and teachers." We seek pastors; we educate pastors and teachers. But our reversal of the divine order has resulted as might have been expected, since law is educational as well as prescriptive. We have unduly lowered the evangelist's office, whereas God placed it before that of pastor. This too is the logical order. A pastor is a shepherd, a keeper of a flock. His office presupposes a flock to be shepherded; and hence, while not pushing this truth beyond reason, it also presupposes evangelists as gatherers of the flock over which, as in Paul's and Timothy's day, shepherds are to be ordained. And we see the effect of such teaching in the suspicion, I might almost say, that prevails largely in the church regarding "unauthorized evangelists." Such remarks as these evince it: "Do you not think they do the church an injury by bringing the regular ministry, or the ordinary services, into disfavor with the people?" These objections will be discussed in their proper place.

This disparagement on the part of some churches of God's appointed agency for reaping, accounts largely for their relative slowness of growth. The large growth of Methodism in one hundred years is not due entirely, or mainly, to the practice of receiving the unconverted *seeking* salvation, while other denominations receive only those supposed to be regenerated; nor yet again to the fact that their system of doctrine is palatable to the natural heart. God's Spirit works through the truth; and with the truth he is mightier than error, even backed by a natural heart. No, rather is their marvelous success found in this: A more correct, I say not correct, interpretation of the law of

God, and of logic, in gathering the flock of God. The system of John Wesley is largely based on an itinerant ministry, preëminently an evangelistic agency in a world as yet unevangelized. True, the confounding of two separate and distinct offices, as ordained of God, has decreased their relative success in training their members, for which God appointed pastors and teachers; yet the prominence given evangelism has made it the most aggressive of all churches in our home field. But why say in the home field? Because other churches are in advance of Methodism in the mission field. And why? Because, while holding to a native pastorate, they ordain their workers as reapers, or missionaries, *i. e.*, evangelists, *in partibus infidelis*.

In Virginia, the stronghold of Presbyterianism in the Southern States, it was the *Synodical* evangelistic work, first conceived and put into operation by that master-builder, Dr. J. H. Rice, that laid the foundation for success, though the founding of Union Seminary in that commonwealth has largely augmented it. Dr. Rice saw the needs of the field. He applied the divinely appointed remedy. He sent to Princeton and brought out to Virginia young men, and sent them out to evangelize the destitute fields. And lo, the harvest still whitening to this day! And in the mountains of Kentucky and the pines of Florida, Presbyterianism keeps pace, if no more may be said, with any denomination, wherever the church keeps pace with them *in evangelistic effort*.

If the world is to be converted, or the gospel preached among all nations for a witness, it must be by *the evangelist*. With the present evangelistic force, how long will it require to do this? The church is losing ground in the great cities, the centres of activities, the *foci* from whence the governing power of nations ever issues. Recently one evangelist said he and one other were the only two ministers laboring in a population of 50,000 heathen in New York City. In Chicago, at a convention one worker offered to lead his hearers in one minute's walk to a district of 50,000, where there was not a single Protestant church. The salvation of our own nation, as well as the evangelization of the world, utters a Macedonian cry for more evangelists. And, if the writer mistakes not, the Spirit is moving in many churches along this line, four pastors in one denomination having in a month resigned or signified their intention to resign pastoral work to engage in the evangelistic service.

This, then, seems to be one of the living questions of the hour: *What shall the church do in order to secure a trained and responsible evangelistic force adequate to the world's harvest call for reapers?* In

answer, it may be a truism to say we must look to God to call out such workers. "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them," said the Holy Spirit when calling these pioneer evangelists. But it is also true, though not so patent to all, that in grace, as in nature, God acts according to established laws of cause and effect. If we fulfil the laws of cause with a eye to the great Efficient Cause, he will insure the effect. Without this we have no right to expect the desired result. Here doubtless is the cause of failure in so many of the church's prayers and aspirations after larger success. She seeks, but seeks amiss. As well expect bread brought by a raven to the praying farmer, when the law is "work and eat," "he that will not work, neither shall he eat."

Let the church act in accord with God's laws of demand and supply, and see if God will not raise up all the evangelists she needs. (1), Reverse the unnatural and unscriptural order in the church's estimate of the two offices, and set forth the office of evangelist in its due importance before the hearts and minds of God's people; (2), Pray the Lord of the harvest to raise up evangelists. How many pastors and churches pray for evangelists? Do not some rather pray "from all such (irresponsible evangelists), good Lord, deliver us?" Why are there so many (?) *irresponsible evangelists*? Is it not because, after eighteen hundred years, not more than 30,000,000 souls out of probably 1,000,000,000 responsible ones are saved by the church's present mode of work? But to save these multitudes God must have his appointed agency, the evangelist. To raise up these under the existing regime he needs must lay hold on some strong characters, and as by an internal volcanic force lift them up through the opposing ecclesiastical crust. Let the church open the way, and seek to *raise up* evangelists as part of her endowment from her Lord, and evangelists will be as much in order, and as orderly, as any other church officer.

To do this we need (a), To infuse into the young men at our colleges and seminaries the spirit of evangelism, a passion for soul saving; (b), We need then to train them for the evangelistic work, a work distinct from the pastor and teacher in the phase of truth to be employed and mode of preaching. The writer was struck with the bold remark of Mr. Moody when Mr. Pentecost was being questioned by an assembly of christian workers: "Mr. Pentecost is no evangelist. He is a born teacher. I would not care if he did not speak to a sinner for five years. But I wish he would follow me in all my meetings." One qualified to teach, one to reap. "Now there are diversities of

gifts, but the same Spirit;" (c), We need to provide for their support in the work.

To provide for these requisites we need TO FOUND IN CONNECTION WITH EACH SEMINARY OR EACH DENOMINATION A LECTURESHIP, NOT PROFESSORSHIP, OF EVANGELISM. Such a fund would enable the directory, not professors, in our seminaries to invite the ablest evangelists and missionaries, foreign evangelists, and other qualified workers in or out of the ministry, to lecture before these institutions.

Thus the spirit of evangelism would be kindled, and those called of God to this work would feel the call, while their brethren would have new zeal infused into them to aid those reapers in the Lord's harvest. This is not speculation. Behold the visit of Messrs. Wilder and Forman, two students, to the colleges and seminaries in the interest of missions—foreign evangelism. Lo! two thousand two hundred young men and women responded to the call of God through these *two young men*,—nearly half as many as we now have in the work after eighty-five years of the old methods. And should only half go out, still glorious has been the experiment inaugurated at a meeting called by an evangelist. Another advantage of this plan is, that the evangelist could in a course of lectures give young men the benefit of the accumulated wisdom learned during years of experience in soul-winning. This we aim to do for the pastorate through the experience and wisdom of professors. But such professors are not evangelists; their experience, their modes of thought, their habits of study, tend to make scholars and pastors and not evangelists. Such evangelistic lectureship would bring men into the work in "the dew of their youth," and yet with the knowledge acquired by others only after years of effort.

But it may be said, evangelists are usually men of marked peculiarities, and the student, it is well known, usually copies the idiosyncracies of strong men. True they are usually men of strong individuality of character, and must be to become leaders of men. But should it be a lectureship, and not professorship, with one lecturer succeeding another, by a natural law of moulding, each succeeding lecturer would tend to deepen that which is common to the work, and pare off that which was but a peculiarity of the individual, just as in the process of composite photography—one obtains a picture of a class, and not of any one individual in the class. The student is not as likely to become an imitator as if he had gone out into the work and fallen under the influence of only one such evangelist. Such instances we all may have seen.

And further, the ever-watchful and experienced professor would be able to point out to them what was merely the mannerism and what the

source of power in the evangelist. Thus the young man, like David with the armor of Saul and the sling, could select the weapons from the spiritual armory opened up to him which best suited his own individuality, the preservation of which is one of the potent factors in success.

Again, if the lecturers be of various denominations there is greater gain. The evangelist goes forth to labor in a world full of all denominations and of "the material of which God makes Calvinists and Arminians, etc.," as an able professor once said. The young man, born, reared and trained in one church, is prone to be narrow. His horizon has always been bounded by one system of doctrine and church polity. He is not pliable. He preaches the truth, but from an extreme on one side; whereas the essence of truth is not found usually on either extreme. And to so preach, though the truth be preached, is not preaching as the spirit of truth and wisdom would teach one to preach so as to win sinners differently trained or constituted. One of the loveliest and most successful evangelists I ever met remarked that when he entered the ministry he met with a denomination hitherto unknown to him. He thought it his duty to "pitch into them;" but an old lady said, "Visit their people first and see the good in them." He did so; he learned to love all who bear the image of Christ, and preached *for* and not *against them* for two years. For success among the masses *breadth of view* and *large charity* are the most essential personal prerequisites. Faith works by love. Faith is power. Love is power in exercise.

Such contact of the students with these godly men—men of not only vital, but vitalizing godliness, and successful soul-winners—will furnish a soul equipment they would otherwise acquire only after years of experience. The Word of God, vitalized by the Holy Spirit and humanized by its manifestation in the life of a saintly witness for Christ, is the most powerful spiritual force in the universe. It may be objected that their varied theological views will influence the young men to the unsettling of their faith. Nowhere can they so safely come in contact with what they must meet with as evangelists, and ought to know, viz., the varied aspects of truth, or even truth and error, which exist in evangelical communions, as in the seminary. Here they are under care of skilled professors, able to correct error and confirm truth.

Lastly, by such lectureship, if the seminary be in a city (as it should be), the evangelist, during his course of lectures, running through a week or ten days, could hold services in some part of the city. He could thus strengthen the cause of God at that point, and, at

the same time, exemplify his lectures by taking the students into the work as helpers.

Such training, with a profound study of the English Scriptures, it is believed would result in sending out from our seminaries many men deeply imbued with a consuming zeal for souls for Christ's kingdom, and with skill as hewers of wood in the mountains of sin for the Lord's temple. And such men the pastors could welcome and follow with joy, shepherding the flock gathered of "such as shall be saved." Is not the Spirit of God now moving the church to its final great conquest for Christ so that many may be found ready and willing to endow such lectureships in all denominations? To such end are these views aimed.

B. HELM.

Ocala, Fla.

JAMES HANNINGTON.

"The History of the Life and Work of James Hannington"¹ will not seem tasteless even to an appetite dulled by a recent reading of the marvelous story of Livingstone's missionary career. The subject is a man altogether worthy to live in the memory and the affections of the christian world; and the author has done full justice to his theme. He was Bishop Hannington's dearest friend; he was the instrument which effected the most important change which could have fallen upon his soul; and he tells his life's story with a warmth of devotion which, chastened by a reserve altogether unerring, has produced one of the most spiritual and touching biographies it has ever been our privilege to read.

Bishop Hannington, who died a martyr at an age when a man is scarcely beyond the upper borders of youth, was in very many particulars one of the most noteworthy characters of the last decade. His early history, and to a less extent his whole career, furnishes a new example of the old observation that every marked man is likely to be peculiar, if not eccentric; that the elements which go to constitute a man an oddity are often not only far from being inconsistent with greatness in a chosen line, but are directly contributory to the success on which that greatness hinges. The petty fopperies and laughter-moving eloquence of Lord Beaconsfield; the French verse-making of Frederick the Great; the dark streak of madness which was woven into the genius

¹ James Hannington: a History of His Life and Work. Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., New York. 1887.

of both Byron and Shelley; all these furnish illustrations of this law. The character *totus, teres atque rotundus*, is nowhere rarer than among names of the first magnitude in history. Genius delights in angles rather than curves; is marked by one-sidedness rather than completeness. Or as one has far better stated it: "Eccentricity has always abounded where strength of character has abounded."

We repeat that Bishop Hannington, who though a mere cadet in years was a veteran in suffering and heroism, was a man of marked and positive eccentricities. As a youth his most prominent trait was an irrepressible mental and physical energy, and a restlessness which made him turn with intolerance from the suggestion that he should succeed his father in his commercial pursuits. At the moment when his disinclination for a mercantile life laid him open to the proposal of any more congenial employment—the moment when, looking at the slight contingencies on which a man's whole future hinges, the sceptic affirms more than elsewhere of chance, and the believer more than elsewhere of God—his mind was turned to the ministry. While we shall find no evidence that he embraced this calling with the solemn heart-searching and anxiety of a spiritual soul, or even discover decided proofs that he had been made alive from the dead, he was yet a man of a character too forceful to accept the responsibilities of his office with levity or unconcern. Not, indeed, with the spiritual strength of conscious weakness, and yet with quite a serious and manly determination, he entered Oxford to prepare himself for orders.

Into the work and the recreations alike of university life he threw himself with enthusiasm. Only a fair student, he nevertheless soon established for himself a preponderant influence among his fellows by the earnestness and intensity of his purposes. Whether as captain of the university "eight," or as the vigorous leader of the students in the last "town and gown row," the boy was unconsciously writing prophecies of the man. One of the most amusing of the many incidents recorded of him, and one of the most forcibly typical of his character, tells that in a desperate boat-race such were his prodigious exertions that, to the intense astonishment of the spectators, he wrought himself quite free of his nether garments, and when he rested at the goal as victor, sat as "slightly garbed as Ulysses and his crew as depicted on some ancient vase." Manly, generous, somewhat too fond of practical joking yet tender-hearted withal, he was by some feared, by many loved, by all respected.

When he entered the university the tendency of his opinions, as far as they had revealed themselves, inclined to the ritualistic party in the

Church of England. The cure of this folly came to him by the method of the *similia similibus*. The author says, "He was soon brought into contact with a set among the undergraduates which professed to be the exponent of the latest and most correct church ritual. The young men who composed this set paid great attention to correctness of posture in chapel, and to niceties of observance in public and private worship. They were fond of dressing themselves, in the privacy of their own rooms, in abbreviated, lace-trimmed surplices, and getting themselves photographed with crozier and censer. In the bed-room of one such we accidentally discovered an altar composed of his trunk, draped with a suitable antimacassar, upon which stood a row of tiny candlesticks and a vase or so of flowers, while above, upon the wall, hung a plaster crucifix."

The spectacle of this folly effectually cured Hannington of any leanings which he may have had towards the ritualistic extreme, and into that tendency he never relapsed. Yet it is a proof of the specific gravity of his moral nature, that even in his youthful re-action he did not swing to an opposite extreme.

His first ecclesiastical labors, as a curate in Martinhoe, were useful and honorable. If not yet personally enriched with an experience of grace, he labored right honestly and faithfully, doing with his might all that his hand found to do. If his own spiritual awakening had not yet been, the moral earnestness and devotion of his ministrations in a wide and poor parish seem to indicate that the "preventing operations" of the Holy Ghost were in progress in his soul.

Nothing in his life, not even the record of his African journeys, can, in our judgment, compare in interest with the history of the spiritual change which soon came to him. A friend, wholly committed to the evangelical doctrines, a friend in whom we cannot fail to recognize his present biographer, sent him during his ministry at Martinhoe the well-known book of Dr. Mackay, *Grace and Truth*. Hannington had written to Mr. Dawson, describing himself as being "in terrible bondage of spirit," and beseeching him to come to him and "bring him light as Ananias did St. Paul." At the moment, his friend could not go to him and sent the book instead. Of the volume Mr. Dawson wisely remarks: "The index finger may be a rude one, but it points plainly and emphatically where lies that narrow path which leads through the cross of Jesus to eternal life." But Hannington was disappointed, not only that his friend could not come, but in the substitute which he had sent. A superficial glance detected, as he thought, that the whole argument of the book was built either on a sophism or a blunder, the treat-

ing of *Nai* in the exclamation of the Syrophenician woman, "Truth, Lord," as if it had been *ἀλήθεια*. Mr. Dawson justly vindicates the author from this charge. But Hannington took no time to discover his own mistake, and cast the book aside with contempt. Some time afterwards he began to read it, solely, he says, that he might be able to tell the giver that he had done so. When he came to the chapter, "Do you feel your sins forgiven?" the effect was such that he must himself describe it:

"I was in bed at the time reading. I sprang out of bed and leaped about the room, rejoicing and praising God that Jesus died for me. From that day to this I have lived under the shadow of his wings, in the assurance of faith that I am his and he is mine."

As soon as he had been ordained to the presbyterate, he was installed as curate over the parish church which his father had built at Hurstpoint. He had now found the one thing needful. To his old intense but now sanctified earnestness of purpose, strong common-sense, warm sympathies, intellectual abilities above the average, and superb physical health, he had now received in addition the "strengthening with might by God's Spirit in the inner man." He became a thoroughly devoted and useful pastor and an effective and fearless preacher. He was enabled to commend himself to every man's conscience in the fear of God. The wealthy and refined held him in respect; the workingmen called him "Jemmy," and loved him in the name.

But while his character was infinitely elevated and sanctified by the great change which had come upon him, he had lost nothing of his cheerfulness, his heartiness, his oddities. A suggestion far from insignificant as to the brightness of his disposition may be read in the pet nick-names which he fixed upon his children. One of them was to him "Gashum," another "Squaliner Grub."

In the year 1878 came tidings to England of the death of Lieutenant Shergold Smith and Mr. O'Neill on the shore of the Victoria Nyanza. Hannington's soul was stirred to its very centres by the tragic story, which served not to affright but to attract him. His thoughts began to recur with an ever-increasing earnestness and conviction to the claims of the mission work on his own heart and life. In 1882, although he was married and a father, as well as actively and usefully engaged in his parish work, he decided to offer himself to the Church Missionary Society for service in Central Africa. The society had just issued a strong appeal for men to reinforce the two alone survivors at Rubaga by the great lake. King Mtesa was still alive; and, while confused by the conflicting teachings of the original missionaries of the

Church of England and of the emissaries of the Church of Rome, he was known to be favorable to missionary enterprise within his borders. Men were needed to improve the opportunity. Hannington's services were gladly accepted. He left "house and parents and brethren and wife and children for Christ's sake and the gospel's." Nothing ever printed can be more heart-rending than the story of his farewells; nothing more affecting than these words at the close of the first entry in his diary after leaving home: "My God, how tender thou art!"

It is not our purpose to dwell at length on the details of Bishop Hannington's missionary career. We have tarried on the earlier years of his life, because with their incidents the public has not been made so familiar as with the facts of his work in Africa. His first missionary journey was, in its immediate results, an utter failure. In the attempt to reach Uganda by the southern and usual route, which lay through vast tracts of pestilential marsh and forest, he was stricken down with an accumulation of the terrible diseases which, sharper-toothed and more deadly than the lion, garrison the Dark Continent. His determination and endurance bore him to the shore of the Nyanza only to hear the sentence that between an immediate return to Europe and inevitable death must be his choice. Most reluctantly he turned to retrace those steps of suffering. It is doubtful if any man ever survived more fearful agonies than were incurred by him on this backward journey. Forced to travel on foot, when the pain of his swollen liver made it necessary that his arms be tied above his head lest they should touch his side, twice or thrice laid on the ground by his bearers as dead, often delirious with fever and racked with dysentery, he pressed on with an iron will, until, contrary to all predictions, he reached the coast and embarked for England, bearing not one least trophy as a reward of his sacrifices or as a consolation to his wounded spirit.

He reached England in June, 1883. Before the year closed, he was again submitting himself to physical examination with a view to a re-appointment to the African mission. From the sweets of the home which he had never expected again to see he was turning, open-eyed, to the pestilence, dangers, despair, of that land of death. What moved him to return? A blind self-will? A spirit of pride and mortified self-love? The ambition to wear the episcopal honors which were now tendered him? None will answer thus save those who read an enigma in the words, "The love of Christ constraineth me." His motives were clear before God, and in the heavenly support which upheld him under the pains of martyrdom to which he was hastening, his acceptance was written. On the 5th of December, he wrote to announce to his friend

that he had been again declared fit for missionary service, in the following characteristic terms :

“MY DEAR ——— :

Hallelujah, Amen.

Hallelujah, Amen.

Hallelujah, Amen.

HALLELUJAH !!!

HALLELUJAH !

And again I cry, Hallelujah!”

On the 24th of June, 1884, just one year after his return to England, he was consecrated bishop of East Equatorial Africa, and sailed for his perilous diocese November 5th. After a brief stay in Palestine, where he had a temporary commission to discharge, the first month of the new year found him in Freretown, meeting and solving the many difficult and delicate problems of his new position. The few months between his arrival and his death in the next October were too brief for the accomplishment of any schemes of ecclesiastical progress which would be considered worthy of record by the mere church historian. After one short journey—long enough indeed when the difficulties and dangers encountered are considered, but short in comparison with that of two years before and the one he was about to take—his thoughts began to turn to the preparations for an episcopal visit to that farthest station in Uganda, to which he had first been destined as a helper. He might have gathered re-inforcing companies and sent them forward while he tarried amid the comforts of the coast; but this was not to “do the work of a bishop” as he understood it. He must visit those isolated missionaries, carry cheer to them by his presence and sympathy, and bring to their support all the force of his official authority.

There was but one possible route to Uganda, if he was to avoid the horrific miasma which haunted the southern course. That southern way he had tried, by its difficulties been turned back; the northern, leading through a section less fatal to Europeans, was made perilous—many thought impassable—by hordes of Masai warriors, the most truculent, untameable robber-savages in Africa. On this latter route he decided, not rashly, not wilfully, but after patient inquiry, careful estimates of the difficulties, and the most judicious provision to meet them. Attended by a single native minister and several hundred African porters, he left the settlement on the 23d of July, 1885.

The experiences of the journey proved that the character of the Masai savages had not been slandered, nor the dangers of meeting them overdrawn. Again and again the little missionary caravan was surrounded by thousands of the “braves,” and involved in dangers

from which nothing but the imperturbable coolness and patience of their leader could have extricated them. But at last these risks had all been safely run, and, after a journey of nearly three months, the great lake was in sight.

But now, by one of those strange conjunctions of events in which there must be a providence, unless we are to believe in a triumphant hell, the condition of affairs in Uganda had undergone a great revolution since the last tidings had reached the bishop. Mtesa was dead; Mwanga, his weak, crafty and suspicious son, was reigning in his stead. That the preaching of the gospel had not been in vain was established by the fact that, contrary to all African precedent, the accession of the new monarch had not been signalized by the wholesale massacre of all his brothers. Yet the sentiment of the court had become bitterly hostile to the influence of the missionaries. One of the young king's chief advisers was a former ambassador to General Gordon at Khartoum, who had returned with an intense hatred of all Europeans. His influence in the kingdom was strengthened by the reports of the action of the Dutch in Zanzibar. Representations were pressed upon Mwanga that his territories were threatened with invasion from the northeast. The three missionaries in Uganda were themselves in imminent peril.

At this critical juncture, Bishop Hannington approached Uganda from the northeast, the very quarter from which his announcement would cause the most intense distrust. Had he come by the other route he might have been safe. But God was in it all. And when the former ambassador to Gordon seized him by the command of the king, he knew that it had all been ordered lovingly and wisely. In the last letter which he ever sent to his wife, he wrote: "The burden of my song must be praise, and the teaching of every lesson has been trust; so comfort your heart during my absence."

We shall not linger even for a moment over the harrowing details of his imprisonment and execution. This, as the most affecting part of his history, has been more often told than any other. The page of the pocket diary, with its microscopic writing and the last pathetic entries, has been again and again reproduced. After eight days of confinement in a vermin-haunted, ordure-polluted hut, during which his heart's toughest fibres were strained by alternate promises of release and threats of death, he was led to execution by the command of the king, without the form even of a charge or an examination. Like his divine prototype in the foreign mission work, "he was taken away from prison and from judgment."

And now, after all, what did he accomplish? Of direct results

almost nothing. On his former journey he did not even reach the scene where his labors were to begin. On the latter, time was only granted him to lay his regulating hand on the affairs of his trying diocese in a few brief touches, and then he was not. He can never be mentioned in connection with those great organizers of missionary success whose names, from the successes which they achieved, won their celebrity. Like the martyred brothers of the island of Eromanga, he was willing to fall if others could use his life as a bridge to pass over to the battle against the kingdom of sin. The social economist declares that his venture involved an unjustifiable waste of life. Even the sober and conscientious christian may be tempted to argue that, by the ties of wife and children and parish needs and duties, God had fastened him to his home, and it would have been better if he had remained there. But casting our estimates by the *formule* of the kingdom of God, testing the quality of this life-risk by the calculations of the Divine Actuary, was his life wasted? Only in the sense in which the life of Jesus Christ was wasted. But gloriously was it saved if this word is true: "He that loseth his life for my sake and the gospel's, shall find it unto life eternal"; made magnificently productive has it been by that law of spiritual husbandry: "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." Or, as Mr. Dawson beautifully expresses this thought: "A life is not always thrown away when it is poured out—poured out as was the water of the well of Bethlehem at the feet of the great king."

What if he had deafened himself to the call of duty which his conscience seemed to be ringing? He would not now, in all probability, be dead; he would be now the unknown, unstoried rector of an English parish, walking his little round without even the gladness which an approving conscience casts upon many a humble life. His usefulness would have been limited by the borders of his parish or its vicinity. A few years more and his dust would have been mingling with other dust not less noble than itself; the corn of wheat would have abode alone. How is it now? His children are fatherless, his wife a widow, his life cut off before high noon. But his hand has touched the heart of the christian world. His name will live for centuries. He has uplifted modern manhood and modern christianhood high above reproach. He has written proofs with his blood that the influence of Christ's example is still the most powerful influence in the world. Chiefest glory of all, his casting down, like Christ's uplifting, is drawing men to the cross. His example is vital with a powerful contagion. His blood "speaketh better things than that of Abel;" it calls, and not in vain, for others to

come with testimonies to the blood of Christ that speaketh the forgiveness of sin. The disjointed members of his body take up the defiance of old Tertullian, and proclaim to Mwanga and his ministers, "*Plures efficimur, quoties metimur a vobis; semen est sanguis christianorum.*" They speak to all the doubtful, and all the timorous, and all who deprecate the sacrifice, these noble words:

"The greatest gift the hero leaves his race
Is to have been a hero. Say we fail!
We feed the high tradition of the world,
And leave our spirit in our children's breasts."

Lexington, Va.

JAMES HENDERSON SMITH.

NOTE.—THE RESTORATION OF THE JEWS.

Part II. of this article (PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY, October, 1887,) presents facts, touching the present state of the Jews in Europe, which should have been credited to *Jewish Intelligence*, *Jewish Herald*, London periodicals, and to "The Jewish Question in Europe," an article in *The British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, October, 1881, by the Rev. Dr. S. H. Kellogg. Particularly, the statements on pp. 258–260, October No. PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY, should have been credited to Dr. Kellogg's excellent article. Facts were also obtained, by personal correspondence, from eminent Hebrew-Christian ministers in Europe.

A. W. MILLER.

VIII. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

DR. WATTS'S REIGN OF CAUSALITY.

THE REIGN OF CAUSALITY. A Vindication of the Scientific Principle of Telic Causal Efficiency. By Robert Watts, D. D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the General Assembly's College, Belfast. New York: Scribner & Welford, 743-745 Broadway. Large 12mo, pp. 414.

In order to give the reader some idea of the purpose and scope of this masterly production, we quote the table of contents: "I. An *Irenicum*: or A Plea for Peace and Coöperation between Science and Theology. II. Atomism: an Examination of Professor Tyndall's Opening Address before the British Association, 1874. III. Automatism—on the Hypothesis that Animals are *Automata*: an Examination of Professor Huxley's Belfast Address. IV. Spencer's Biological Hypothesis. V. On some Questions raised by the Authors of the 'Unseen Universe.' VI. Agnosticism. VII. The Huxleyan Kosmogony. VIII. Science and Pseudo-Science. IX. Evolution and Natural History. X. Natural Law in the Spiritual World. XI. Utilitarianism." The author thus explains the design of the work:

"The object of the discussions embraced in this volume is indicated in the title. The chief aim of the whole work is to vindicate the claims of the scientific principle of Telic Causality [that is, Causality operating not blindly, but with an end in view]. Persuaded that the very unhappy attitude of antagonism to theology maintained by a certain class of scientists has arisen from scientific speculations conducted in violation of this principle, the author has endeavored, in the interests of both science and theology, to draw attention to the gravity of this error, and to make it clear that the existing antagonism is as unscientific as it is gratuitous. The ground taken is, that the principle of Causality, revealed as a primary belief in consciousness, fairly carried out and applied in scientific investigations, leads up to an ultimate Cause—a *Causa causarum*—possessed of all the attributes which enter into our conception of personality. This ground, it is held, is truly philosophic and scientific, and ought to be regarded as common ground in all controversies arising out of the scientific study of matter or of mind. . . . Now, the primary fundamental principle which philosophy holds forth as a lamp to light the pathway of the scientist is, that every effect must have a cause,—and by this is meant an adequate cause, a cause that will account for the *production* of *all* the phenomena under investigation in the particular instance."

After showing that consciousness testifies not only to the existence of this principle but to efficiency or productive energy as implicated in it, and that the hypothesis of Hume and his disciples which supposes a mere order of sequence is in contradiction to consciousness, and is utterly impracticable as a working hypothesis, the author proceeds to say:

"It is hoped that the discussions embraced in this volume will aid in drawing attention to the unphilosophic conception of Causality entertained by the anti-theistic writers of the day, who are availing themselves of every channel of access to the public, to assail the foundations on which are based the immortal hopes of man. It is claimed in the following pages that the principle on which the assault

upon theology proceeds is subversive of sound philosophy and genuine science, as, in every instance, it does violence to the scientific fundamental of adequate Causality. And it is further claimed that within the sphere of the phenomena with which science has to do, adequate Causality is invariably telic. . . . A thorough analysis of all the phenomena, revealing, as it must, the adaptation of means to ends, ought to conduct the investigator back behind the phenomena and the ordered array of ends and means, to an antecedent, presiding intelligence, to whose forethought and presidency both the ends and the means should be ascribed. The concatenation and coördination of second causes, admitted by all scientists as an unquestionable fact, demand explanation, and no explanation will satisfy the human mind which does not refer them to a truly telic causal efficient."

We have read this book with profound interest. We would not speak extravagantly, but it has impressed us as characterized by uncommon ability, by a pervading soundness of thought, and by a quiet but determined courage which could only spring from a consciousness of having mastered the subjects which are discussed. Professor Watts is not afraid to cross swords with the most distinguished scientific specialists of the age. In each particular department of science he fights with none but the king. He attacks Tyndall and Huxley and Spencer with the boldness of one who feels himself to be the peer of each of them, not, perhaps, in the field of practical observation and the minute study of special phenomena, but in the ability to deal with reported facts in their relation to the laws in accordance with which they occur and to the causes to which they owe their origin. The mere classifier of facts, proceeding by logical analysis and generalization, may be satisfied when he has discovered an element which is capable of no further resolution. Such an element becomes to him the basis of classification. Or he may be content with a particular quality which sustains a general relation to a number of individuals. Upon that quality he arranges all the individuals possessing it into a class, and designates it by a common name. He is not in quest of ultimate efficient causes, but of ultimate facts. But Professor Watts, as we conceive, justly holds that neither the scientist nor the metaphysical philosopher can rest in such an attainment. Each is in search of efficient causes to which the production of facts may be referred; nor ought either to be satisfied until he has reached an efficient cause which is ultimate—a cause of causes. The universe is a great complex of diversified and innumerable phenomena. If the fundamental constitution of our minds is of any value, if our primary beliefs are worth anything, we cannot remain content with the view that this grand totality is a mere rabble of disconnected facts. We are impelled to relate the facts to each other as produced by forces operating in an orderly manner; and when we have begun this process we are inevitably led backwards to elements more and more simple, and to causes more and more tending to one first cause possessed of absolute unity. In addition to this, both the scientist and the philosopher, or rather the metaphysician and the theologian—since the former ought also to be a philosopher—are led by their investigations to notice the marks of design in all around, above and beneath. This, in obedience to a law of our constitution which demands a cause adequate to the production of observed effects, ought to lead to the acknowledgment of an ultimate cause characterized by intelligence, and therefore by personality.

Armed with this mighty principle of what he terms Telic Causality, the author moves fearlessly forward to the encounter with the giants of scientific infidelity. It is his weapon of aggression and his armor of defense—the ponderous spear of Achilles and the seven-fold Telamonian shield. In the application of this principle

he has successfully combated the molecular atomism of Tyndall, the materialistic naturalism of Huxley and the agnosticism of Spencer. Grant him his assumption of the fundamental laws of thought and belief implicitly contained in the constitution of the human mind, in general, and, in particular, the fundamental law of causality, and his argument against these scientific hypotheses is irresistible. It was not Dr. Watts's design to prove the existence of these primary laws of the human mind, at least to prove them by elaborate argumentation. He was, we think, entitled to regard them as great autopistic presuppositions, upon the ground which even Cicero maintained, that what all men believe must be received as true. Otherwise the human mind must be supposed to have emanated as an engine of falsehood from a malign and lying cause; in which case no argumentation upon any subject would have the least trustworthiness. It would not matter, in the smallest degree, what either Professors Tyndall and Huxley, or Mr. Spencer, or Dr. Watts might say. David Hume, the apostle of nescience, would be the only consistent philosopher, and, *e concesso*, all that he could say would amount to *nothing*. Strike out of existence our reliance upon the data of consciousness, and the fundamental principles to which they lead by logical necessity, as grounding the certitude of human knowledge, and, as Dr. Lyman Beecher used to say, "the bottom is knocked out of human nature", and all the world is mad." What would signify the contentions of philosophers, scientists and theologians more than the illusive demonstrations of the victim of morphine, or the furious reasoning of the crazy pauper who demands allegiance to his throne.

We would be glad, did the space allotted to a critical notice like this allow it, to present in a condensed form the arguments employed by the author in this remarkable work. But it would be impracticable in so short a compass to give an outline of a course of reasoning as compact as that contained in this book. The attempt would mar the discussion. We will, therefore, not make it. We would, however, call attention to the work as richly deserving the serious study of both the friends and the foes of the scientific hypotheses which are submitted to examination. Especially would we commend to young men the arguments of the author in regard to evolution, whether contemplated in its atheistic form as held by Tyndall, Huxley and Spencer, or in its restricted aspect as the transmutation of species, an aspect in which it is advocated by some who profess to be theists. He shows that either Professor Tyndall or Professor Huxley is not gifted with infallibility, since they contradict each other, that Mr. Spencer, as Professor Borden P. Bowne had previously shown, destroys most effectually the claim preferred for him of being the philosophical pope of science by his flagrant self-contradiction, and that all of them are proved to be fallible in their *ex cathedra* utterances by their contradiction alike of consciousness and the Bible. He boldly espouses and vindicates the doctrine of special creation by supernatural interventions, in opposition to that of evolution, notwithstanding the alleged trend of science towards the adoption of the latter; and in response to the demand for scientific proof of special creation, not only challenges the same sort of proof in support of evolution, but boldly takes the ground that it has not been furnished—that not a single unquestionable fact has been yet adduced in its establishment. If this be so, one cannot help being astonished at the remarkable spectacle of scientific men propounding a scientific conclusion which has no facts as its foundation. Meanwhile the palpable fact of hybridity, open to the observation of all men, still throws its baleful shadow across the

path of the evolutionary hypothesis, and, as Professor Huxley intimates in his "Origin of Species," threatens to shatter it.

We also invoke special attention to that part of the author's argument which addresses itself to the consideration of "Natural Law in the Spiritual World." That curious combination of words has become familiar in consequence of their being the title of a work by Professor Henry Drummond, which has, like all heterodox products of *orthodox* theologians, acquired great popularity. It must be confessed that some credit is due for the wonderful *éclaircissement* claimed by the book and ascribed by many to it, if any credit is due at all, to the Duke of Argyll with whose heifer the author has ploughed. For it is certain that the eye-opening discovery of the identity of natural and spiritual law must, so far as we know, be accredited to the Duke's *Reign of Law*. But whatever may be the paternity of the affirmations, that natural and spiritual law are not only analogous but identical, that in accordance with the scientifically established principle of the continuity of law, that which begins as natural must persist as natural, and therefore engross into itself what is mis-called spiritual law in contradistinction to natural, and that consequently redemption itself is no exception to the sweep of continuous law, for science will not hear of any exception to it,—Professor Watts deals with them very unceremoniously, having no respect of persons before his eyes, and not being abashed by reverence for nobility on the one hand, or a Free Church theological professorship on the other. He shows the work of Professor Drummond no quarter. We hope that those who have read the work will also procure and read this book of Dr. Watts. It is but fair that both sides be heard. The style of this book is as charming as its arguments are powerful. We repeat the recommendation to our readers to get it and ponder its contents. It will amply repay them.

What difference we may have with one or two positions of Dr. Watts we will sink out of view, in deference to the profound admiration we feel for the general ability and soundness of his work.

JOHN L. GIRARDEAU.

DORNER'S CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS. *By Dr. Isaac A. Dorner, Oberconsistorialrath and Professor of Theology, Berlin. Edited by Dr. A. Dorner; translated by C. M. Mead, D. D., and Rev. R. T. Cunningham, M. A.* New York: Scribner & Welford. 1887. Octavo, pp. 616.

The author of this treatise was born in 1809, and died in 1884. He was made *repentent* in the theological department of the University of Tübingen as early as 1834; became professor "extraordinary" in 1838; professor "ordinary" at Kiel in 1839; at Königsberg 1843; in 1847 at Bonn; in 1853 at Göttingen; and from 1862 to his death, at Berlin. These facts are sufficient evidence of his ability and learning. He came to the United States in 1873 as a delegate to the Evangelical Alliance which met that year in the city of New York, and read in that assembly a paper on the "Infallibility of the Vatican Council." His principal works are his "System of Christian Theology," his "History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ," his "History of Protestant Theology," and his "Christian Ethics," the work before us. He did not live to complete the elaboration of this work for the press, but it is not a mere *torso*, as any one who grapples with it will be convinced.

Dr. Dorner's theological position is indicated by the work above mentioned on the "Person of Christ." It "aimed to show that the primitive church, being both the product and the portrayer of the person and work of Jesus, its foundations are secure against being shaken by any criticism of the details of the written record." "Dorner's theological labors," says his friend Professor Von der Goltz, "had from the outset two fixed starting points, closely connected with one another in the idea of personality—the theanthropic person of Christ and justifying faith. Christ the centre of piety, Christ the head that animates the church, Christ the centre of the creation of God and of the world's history, Christ the second Adam, as the essential and perfect vehicle of God's condescending holy love to men, but also as the prototype of a permanent humanity destined for fellowship with God and transfiguration in God; this, on the one hand, and, on the other, justifying faith, as the source not only of the doctrine but also of the life of the evangelical church; . . . these were the two poles between which Dorner's research and production moved. His motto was Colossians ii. 3."

Such being his theological position, we are not surprised to find him despising all utilitarian types of ethics, whether they flow from a materialistic and sensualistic or from a professedly christian source. He believes in a first Good as well as in a first True and a first Fair. He is not satisfied until he gets back to an absolute good in the absolute God. Plato himself was not more enamored with these archetypal ideas than is this theologian and philosopher of the nineteenth century.

As might be expected, his method is *à priori* and intuitional to a considerable extent; but the historical element is never long out of sight. High as he often soars into the clouds and mist—so high, we confess, that our feeble vision is unable to follow him—yet he *does* come back to the earth to verify his celestial observations and to furnish a chart for the guidance of ordinary mortals.

"What subject," said Edmund Burke, "does not branch out into infinity?" This question will often occur to the reader of the German authors. They are all inclined to the method of their great countryman Leibnitz, who began his history of the House of Brunswick with inquiries into the condition of pre-Adamite man. Dorner is no exception. He discusses several subjects, ethnology for example, which have no close or obvious connection with ethics. This cannot be said, however, of the subject of the relations of the sexes. His observations on this topic evince excellent common sense and great elevation and purity of sentiment. We shall be pardoned for quoting a few sentences: "The one human life divides into two poles, *strength* and *beauty*; with the one, through a moral process, there comes to be connected ethical dignity, with the other, ethical grace. But this difference is by no means merely physical; it extends even into the mental nature of mankind; for Christ by no means says (Matt. xx. 30) that this difference will be utterly obliterated, but only that the conditions of marrying and being given in marriage, of this earthly, physical marking of the difference of sex, will be removed." (Page 151.) Again: after showing that woman is adapted for those spheres of activity in which the devotion of the whole nature is required (such as the family and the church), and that she is not adapted to "one-sided spheres" (such as friendship, the state, art and science,) so as to be actively productive in them, adds: "And in this matter women's universities and attempts at the so-called emancipation of women will not alter anything, but will only attain the result that women will seem less amiable to us men. On the other hand, woman is admirably endowed for guarding the

masculine nature and the spheres specially intrusted to it from such one-sidednesses as are inconsistent with a comprehensive spirit and with harmonious unity. For women, over against all such one-sidednesses into which the masculine nature is apt to fall, represent universal human nature." (P. 154.) The chapter on marriage (pp. 522 ff.) also does credit to the heart and head of the author and is worthy of the people who have been commended, from the time of Tacitus down, for deeming that there is *sanctum aliquid* in woman. Would that the wise men of the East who have had so much to do with introducing and circulating mischievous opinions of the Germans might give heed to Dorner's sound opinions on marriage, and so avoid that abyss of corruption and social ruin into which they seem doomed to fall.

But it is time to give our readers some idea of the plan and contents of Dr. Dorner's book. After an Introduction, in which the precise relations of christian ethics to faith and dogmatics, on the one hand, and to philosophical ethics on the other, have been defined, and after the starting-point has been stated and illustrated, the author proceeds to expound his "system" in two "parts," each part subdivided into "divisions," and these divisions again subdivided into "sections," and the sections into chapters. The first part is entitled "Foundation—the Pre-requisites and Preliminary Stages of Christian Morality." The second part (and to the generality of readers much the clearest and most interesting part) is entitled "The Good as Realized in Christianity," under which we have as the first division, "Christ the God-Man," "Ethical Christology;" as the second, "Christian Virtue as Exhibited in the Individual;" as the third, "The Organized World of Christian Morality, the Moral Communities in the Kingdom of God." (By "the moral communities" are meant the family, the state, and the church.)

Translation is not an easy work in the most favorable circumstances; translation from German into English seems to be particularly difficult; translation of the German theological and philosophical treatises into English appears to be the most difficult of all. The translator appears too often as an "egregious traducer" (according to an ancient jest) of his original, and his work (according to another state jest) to be rather an "oversetting" of his original than a translation. Whoever has read—and who has not read?—De Quincey's facetious description of the German style, will not wonder that writers in that language should not readily be presented in idiomatic English. Dr. Schaff must have been born under a favorable junction of the stars, to have fallen upon such a translator as Mr. Yeomans. We do not wish to be understood as finding fault with Dr. Dorner's translators. The means are not at hand for forming a judgment. We only wish to hint that the style of this valuable treatise is not as enchanting as that of the "Spectator."

THOMAS E. PECK.

THE RITCHLIAN DOCTRINE OF REDEMPTION.

DIE GEWISSEHEIT DES GLAUBENS UND DIE FREIHEIT DER THEOLOGIE, von Dr. W. Hermann, ord. Professor der Theologie zu Marburg. Freiburg in B. 1887. Pp. 64. 8vo.

The most commanding figure at this moment in the German theological world is undoubtedly Albrecht Ritschl. We are told that he is not the founder of a school; he is at least the head of a large and growing party, which feels itself entrusted with a mission and is determined to fulfil it; while, on the other hand, it is

the common object of attack of old Lutheran and old Tübinger alike. How his followers look upon him may be illustrated out of the book which now lies before us:

"Ritschl's theology," says Professor Hermann, "has the honor of having made such an impression on a wide circle that men hold themselves called upon to protect theology from its power by forcible measures. We have certainly not to thank our great numbers for this. Even if we count Ritschl himself, we cannot with any justice say more than that there are at present in Prussia five ordinary professorships filled with such men as can be reckoned as representatives of Ritschl's theology, and one of these five has been certified by the church journal of the Positive Union as not belonging to Ritschl. Just as little can the attention that is being granted to us be attributed to our strong influence upon the struggles of church parties. We value these struggles no little; but we have no time to take part in them, since a much more pressing task weighs on us. Neither can it be said that the old enemies of the church-majority, the theologians of the '*Protestantenevangelium*' and their companions, are brought to the top by us. With this group we stand, on good grounds, in the worst possible odor. The two books of this tendency which have justly aroused the greatest offense during the last few years have been subjected by us, *with respect to their scientific value*, to an estimate of a sharpness not equalled in any criticism emanating from the churchly party; I mean Pfleiderer's '*Philosophy of Religion*' and Bender's work on the '*Essence of Religion*.' Consequently no one, certainly, can charge us with encouragement of this kind of religion. Nevertheless we can without doubt aver that if the same men should produce books of scientific content, their church-standing will certainly not prevent us from thanking them for them. What secures such hostile attention to Ritschl's theology is, before everything else, the circumstance that, among all the productions of living theologians, it is the single impressive figure about which there is very much to say. In addition to this, it is in a position to bring a small number of theologians to such an agreement in their ground-thoughts as can nowhere else be found in like great degree. If we look to the left, Lipsius and Pfleiderer, if a broader activity had fallen to their lot, would found schools which could not but diverge very widely apart; if we look to the right, we can perceive that between the versatile Luthardt and the ponderous Frank there must lie a mountain of ice. We, on the contrary, are united in the struggle after a positive ecclesiastical end, which is so shaped that it must give to our theological work a homogeneous stamp. Ritschl himself says on this subject: 'Like Bogatzky in 1750, we can establish the observation that we are in the presence of a new specific form, which separates from pietism, which does not, however, as then, tend to rationalism, but which directs itself to the end which has never yet succeeded in obtaining full acceptance, that of making effective Luther's whole view (*Gesamttanschauung*) of christian faith and life.' (History of Pietism, Vol. III., p. vi.) Ultimately, certainly all who hold the ground-thoughts of the Reformation to be true, and who love the evangelical church, will follow us on this road. Meanwhile, no doubt, the most are displeased with the form which the practical end alone gives to our theology, the resolute concentration on the one fact of revelation and redemption, the historical figure of Jesus Christ. We are by no means surprised at this. For, as we turn away from every other foundation of faith, some miss the connection, indispensable to them, of the religious view of life with science. Others see retire into the background the things which follow, indeed, as results of the faith which finds itself on Christ, but which have passed with them hitherto as the veritable objects of faith, such as the Christology of the ancient church and the mediæval doctrine of the atonement. To us, this opposition is altogether right; for it impels us to bring the matter to that clearness in which it must vanquish every opposition on the part of those who wish to be evangelical christians. What we are in search of is to free what supplies christians with assurance of faith, and therewith communion with God and a new life, from the thicket of dogmatic conceptions which has so long overgrown it that the good of assurance of faith can no longer be grasped with certain understanding. We will succeed in this if we do not lose ourselves in a negative criticism of dogmas, but rather complete the positive proof of how the faith that means redemption is established in the christian. In that case, what is secondary and supererogatory will of itself give place to the one thing needful." (Pp. 15, 16.)

There is a charming air of practical christian devotion about such words as these, which prepares the reader to estimate all that a writer who so manifestly loves the Lord has to say, at its highest value. Hermann openly declares that he is willing to leave to others all dogmatic discussion as to what faith is, if only he can bring men to believe. Faith, nevertheless, implies a certain amount of knowledge; and on approaching a teacher of a new creed, we are bound to pause to ask him what it is which he calls on us to believe. It reads very well to hear that we are to be rid of metaphysics and mysticism and to receive back again the simple historical Christ; but when we begin to ask who is this historical Christ and for what should we trust in him, the way grows dark.

Ritschl's system has not been placed very luminously before the public. In discarding metaphysics he seems to discard, as mere speculations, all those essential doctrines of christianity on which the saving work of Christ depends—the Trinity, the divinity of Christ, the vicarious sacrifice. In exalting "the historical Christ," he seems to dispense with the exalted Christ and the historical work of his ever-present Spirit. In proclaiming the love of God he appears to forget his justice. Nor does his enthusiastic follower, Hermann, with whom we have more particularly to do at this time, give us a faith by which a man may live. His present booklet is itself the fruit of controversy, and has already a history. In 1886 he published a book under the title of "The Communion of the Christian with God in Conformity with Luther" (Stuttgart: Cotta; 8vo., pp. iv., 205), in which he put forth his views regarding communion with God as dependent on faith in the historical Christ, in opposition to Pietistic and Sacramentarian opinions alike, as only a recalling of Luther's own teachings to the church. This was at once severely reviewed by Luthardt in his *Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft und k. Leben* (1886, No. XII.), and the present booklet is a rejoinder to this review. It has already been in turn answered by Luthardt in the pages of the same journal (1887, No. IV). Let us now ask, what is its characteristic teaching?

The basis of what is here said was of course laid in the former work on the "*Communion with God*." Here we have it only in a more polemic shape. What, then, does Hermann mean by communion with God through faith in the "historic Christ"? Since God is a personal spirit, he tells us, we can draw near to him only by coming into such a position towards him that we experience the objects and occurrences of the real world in such a way that they become to us distinctly comprehensible as manifestations of God to us. The realization of the fact of Christ's appearance in the world brings us to this needful position. We only need to learn to know him in order to be compelled to think that there is a power above all things earthly which works in the world; that there is a God who really forgives sins and cares for us in a saving way. "And if it is only under the impression of the person of Jesus that the reality of God becomes certain to us, it is by it that God enters into communion with us. What Jesus brings to effect upon us becomes to us an act of God. Since he, by his historical appearance, brings God for us into our field of view, he becomes himself the manifestation through which God draws near to us. The contents of the word, through which God has communion with us, is Jesus Christ. Therefore all comes to this, that we should understand this word and let ourselves be strengthened inwardly by it. Only on such an understanding have we communion with God" (p. 38). We may catch the drift of this without difficulty. Against the high-church Lutheranism, Hermann denies that we are to

obtain communion with God only through the wonder-working power of the means of grace. Against "Pietists, Methodists, and mystics," he denies that our intercourse with God is merely in the world of phantasy. He insists that "we meet our God in the real world, for, on the ground of the fact that Jesus Christ is an undeniable element of our own reality, we experience and live through all things and events in the world as manifestations of God to us, as guides from an almighty Father's love, which really forgives us our sins and cares for us in a saving way." In a word, we are in a world of hard earthly realities, and we could not here know that God is, or that he cares for us. In this world Christ appears, and by his life here reveals the fact that God is, and that he loves us and cares for us and would save us. He is the great, the one revelation. In the light of that revelation we now live, and, on coming to understand that it has been made, we are no more blind to God, but see his hand about us in all providence, manifesting himself to us. So seeing, we are having communion with God. Thus our communion with him is not in the world of phantasy, it is in the world of fact; it is not through the means of grace, it is through Jesus Christ.

Insisting anew on this position, Hermann advances now to a new contention. Only thus can we have communion with God, and only thus can we obtain assurance of faith. Certainly natural reason cannot give us the certitude we ask, nor can we base ourselves on the word of Scripture, now that we can no longer believe in the inspiration of Scripture. What can assure man that his faith is grounded on a rock in these days of scientific doubt and critical attack? Nothing, he answers, but a fact, the experience of a fact in the world of our own reality; and "the birth hour of our faith has not struck for any one of us until this fact of Jesus Christ comes forward in our lives, and through its contents forces us to the conviction that its presence in our lives is God's hand upon them." "We should not, indeed, seek this decisive manifestation of God in the narrow limits of the individual life, but rather should recognize it in our life as enlarged in its historical connection." But the realization of the fact that such an one as Christ once lived, and lived in this sphere of human life, overcomes us, reveals God as a living God to us, and begets in us a living faith which, just because founded on a fact in this world of reality, is founded on an immovable rock. Again, we need not fail to understand our author's meaning here. All that Christ does for us is to have lived in the world. The way he comes into our lives is by our eyes resting on him as a figure in the historical past. He is not our sacrifice and not our substitute; he is only our revelation of God. To believe in him, is to be sure he lived; to understand him, is to see through his life that God lives, loves, and would save; to be saved by him, is to be led through this revelation to "walk with God," and do our part below like men.

We are not concerned with Luthardt's controversy with Hermann, so far as it is a controversy of the strict Lutheran; but we are concerned with it when it becomes the controversy of evangelical christianity. We can see much in Hermann that is well said against the Lutheran doctrine of the means of grace; but we turn wholly to Luthardt's side in all that is important in the controversy. We ask with him, Is, then, Jesus only a memory, which we are to bring home to our mind? or is he not a presence whom we are to experience? We ask whether he is only a fact of the past, or also a fact of the present? an occurrence that came and went, or an abiding fact of all time? We ask, are we to preach a history, merely, that hap-

pened eighteen hundred years ago, and call on men now to do their part? or are we to preach an ever-accessible Saviour who ever lives to make intercession for us? We agree that there can be no certainty of faith "save that which is based on and rests on the person of Jesus Christ with its irresistible power as a fact." But we insist that it must be on the real person of the real Christ, in the entirety of his divine-human personality, and of his sacrificial work, that faith rests, if it is to save. We agree that there can be no communion with God save such as is in Christ; but not because he simply appeared in the world, flitted across the stage to dazzle the eyes of men with the wonder of a perfect life and was gone, but because he appeared once in the end of the world to reconcile God to us by his blood.

Delitzsch thinks that the whole Ritschlian system is too dark and obscure to take root at all in Britain and America; but in its most essential feature we are not so unfamiliar with it as it may seem. We have heard from other lips that "God is love" in the sense that he will not mark iniquity; and that Christ's death was a sacrifice only in that it was an act of obedience by which, as a martyr, he sealed his revelation with his blood. The Ritschlian doctrine of redemption is essentially the moral influence theory in its baldest form. For the other elements of the system, they are such as go with an insufficient view of sin and grace, or an overstrained reaction against doctrinal elaboration. Unfortunately we are not strangers to this either in America. Every month our periodical literature presents us with doctrinal developments which run on quite parallel lines, and which advertise to us that we may in Britain and America be preparing a soil in which Ritschlianism might, once it were planted, make a rank and rapid growth, and bring forth its fullest fruit in its season. Mr. John Skelton, C. B., for instance, in the January *Blackwood*, in writing of "John Knox and William Maitland," reacts from Calvinism so sharply that he approaches a similar position, so far as the doctrine of redemption is concerned. Most of the reformers, the Luthers, and Calvins, and Knoxes, held, in his view, a "whimsically tragic scheme of doctrine," from which "a horror of great darkness rose up like a pestilential exhalation from the pit, obscuring the gracious light and benignant glory of heaven;" for this light and glory he would have us understand, could have nothing to do with sacrifice and substitution and blood atonement. Nevertheless "it need not be doubted," he thinks, "that among the early reformers there were many simple and earnest souls to whom spiritual verities were intensely real—who saw the pure and noble figure of Jesus waiting for them in the heavens, while meantime they themselves, in an evil world, fought the good fight and kept the faith which he had bequeathed them." Yes, here it is. Christ is a "pure and noble figure." He has lived; and has bequeathed a faith to men. Meanwhile he sits "waiting in heaven," while men "themselves in an evil world fight the good fight." There are some of us who see more "gracious light and benignant glory" in a "jealous God," who yet gives his Son that "his elect, thus vicariously punished and vicariously redeemed," may be taken up "to dwell with their Master and Saviour in heaven," than in a "waiting" Saviour who leaves us to fight our fight ourselves in this evil world; some who have no trust in "spiritual verities" unaccompanied with provision for the cleansing of guilt from the consciences of sinful men.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

SHEARER'S "SYLLABUS."

BIBLE COURSE SYLLABUS. *By Rev. J. B. Shearer, D. D., Professor of Biblical Instruction, Southwestern Presbyterian University, Clarksville, Tenn. Complete in three volumes.*

A few years after the late war, Stewart College, which had shared the fate of so many Southern institutions, was resuscitated, and mainly through the instrumentality of Dr. Shearer. By a favorable providence the college has been expanded into the present ample and efficient university. From the first, on assuming the presidency of the college, Dr. Shearer was aflame with the idea of giving the English Bible a place of prominence in the curriculum. His prayers and labors have been crowned with a gratifying success. In this matter he deserves the honors of a pioneer and the praise of an enthusiast.

Dr. Shearer's object was not to inculcate a system of theology, but to impart such a knowledge of the English Scriptures as every educated man ought to have, and must have in order to be *fully* educated. "No man is a scholar who is not as familiar with his Bible as with his algebra or Horace." "There is nothing valuable in the domain of human thought and action, whether civil, political, social, legal, moral, religious, ecclesiastical, philosophical, or scientific, etc., for which we do not find a warrant in the Scriptures, or at least a concrete illustration; and further, there is no heresy in any of these departments which is not refuted directly or by implication by the infallible Word of God." "Studied thus, the Scriptures become the final appeal and test of all truth."

These little volumes are the fruit of fourteen years of practical instruction in his college and university classes. They consist of notes and references, and are intended strictly for class-work. The binder has inserted blank leaves between the printed pages for purposes of note-taking.

Volume I., for the junior class, covers the first books of the Bible up to the close of Samuel's administration. Volume II., for the intermediate class, begins with the inauguration of the kingdom of Saul and comes down to the birth of Christ. The four hundred years between the closing of the Old Testament canon and the opening of the New are covered by Prideaux's *Connexion*. Volume III., for the senior class, covers the Gospels and the Acts, and besides these histories the Syllabuses are mostly resumé studies, and form the notes of the professor's lectures. An examination of these will show that the author, in these days of liberal thought and reckless criticism, adheres firmly to our confessional theology. "Graduation in this course is necessary to any degree in the institution."

We write these pleasant things because we are an *alumnus* of the Southwestern University, and appreciate to this day the benefits of the "Bible Course Proper" which we took under Dr. Shearer's tuition, and before the course had been so perfected and printed as now.

We further vindicate this idea, which refuses to divorce secular and Biblical instruction, by an appeal to the constitution of man. Human life is influenced by rational, moral and religious truth, and there are important relations between all three. A powerful intellectual development, with a dormant or depraved conscience, is a monstrosity. A powerful intellectual and moral development without religion is a glittering failure. Without intellect man is a fool; without conscience he is wicked; without religion he is depraved. Educate the intelligence, and you

give him the power of knowledge; educate the conscience, and you give him the power of uprightness; educate the religious nature, and you give him the power of devotion. An education, therefore, which provides alone for man's intellectual and moral natures is one-sided and fractional. A complete education seeks to train and develop every power of the human soul. For the intellectual, the classics, the natural and exact sciences may be sufficient in the stage when the youth is under tutors and governors; for the moral, mental philosophy and ethics may be adequate; and for the religious, at least the facts of the Bible are required. Surely the religious, which is the highest and most important element of the human constitution, cannot be neglected altogether without serious detriment. Hence the importance of the denominational college as compared with the state school; it can introduce the Bible—the text-book of religion—without any inconsistency whatsoever, and thus educate man's whole nature and not two-thirds alone.

Besides being adapted to the ends for which they were written, Dr. Shearer's volumes are useful as text-books for higher Bible-classes in Sabbath-schools, and also as a syllabus of connected lectures, extending over the whole Bible, in connexion with the weekly prayer-meeting.

R. A. WEBB.

LADD'S ELEMENTS OF PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY.

ELEMENTS OF PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY: A Treatise of the Activities and Nature of the Mind; From the Physical and Experimental Point of View. *By George T. Ladd, Professor of Philosophy in Yale University.* Cloth, 8vo, pp. xii., 696. Price, \$4.50. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1887.

LET not the reader infer from the title of this work that there is anything "elementary" about it, or that we have here any new science of psychology. All are aware of the very intimate connection and interaction of mind and body. Physiological psychology is simply a scientific setting forth of this familiar fact. It endeavors to bring the physical phenomena of the nervous system and the psychical phenomena (states of consciousness) face to face, to look at them as they stand thus related to each other, and, as far as possible, to unite them in terms of uniform character under law. In order to this, there must be an ascertaining and comparing together all the important phenomena; the laws or regular modes of the occurrence of the phenomena are then to be investigated; after this, certain conclusions may be drawn concerning the nature and significance of those real beings which reason compels us to assume as permanent subjects of the different classes of phenomena.

In pursuance of this simple and rational arrangement Professor Ladd's work falls naturally into three capital divisions:

Part I.—The Nervous Mechanism.—Under this head we have seven chapters, or 236 pages, illustrated by eighty-two figures, devoted to the histology of the whole nervous system.

Part II.—Correlations of the Nervous Mechanism and the Mind, comprising eleven chapters, or 343 pages, likewise illustrated with many plates. This division, which forms the body of the book, treats such topics as Localization of Cerebral Function, Sensations, their Quality and Quantity, Presentations of Sense, Time Relation of Mental Phenomena, Feelings and Motions, Physical Basis of the Higher Faculties.

These two divisions of the work will require very close study from the reader and will demand for their full appreciation a much wider scope of scientific knowledge than most men possess. We find most of the plates very unsatisfactory; they seem to us to have been adapted from some other work, and by no means illustrate the text as they might do if designed especially for it.

Part III.—The Nature of the Mind.—In this division we have four chapters, or 103 pages. The Faculties of the Mind, and its Unity; the Development of the Mind; Real Connection of Brain and Mind; the Mind as Real Being. This last division is the shortest and richest, the cream of the whole book.

In this work Professor Ladd undertakes one of the most difficult and abstruse studies; one in which there is little of that aid which comes from community of work, for so far as the English language is concerned he treads his path alone; a study which is encompassed by insuperable natural barriers in the necessary conditions and limitations imposed by the character of the subjects treated.

His faithfulness, exhaustiveness and patience in elaborate and multiplied detail; his modesty and candor, none too common in these departments of study; his absence of dogmatism and confession of ignorance; his careful discrimination between mere inference, however just, and fact, between scientific conjecture, however rational, and verified certainty, these characteristics command high appreciation and ready acknowledgment at our hands. The book is in many respects a credit to its author, to the great school he represents, and the greater country which is honored by his scholarship and his labor.

Dr. Ladd is practically a pioneer. In the exact and comprehensive scope of his scheme there is no companion to his volume in the same tongue. Of course this increases his labor. Again, the two subjects of correlation are not homogeneous; our knowledge of each is at best but a fraction, and it is almost impossible to reduce the two fractions to a common denominator. Even the simpler of the two terms is still in its infancy as a science; the mechanism of the nerves is as yet an unsettled portion of the world of knowledge, much of it unoccupied, save here and there a small clearing amid a virgin forest. Microscopic anatomy of the nerves cannot be other than unsatisfactory.

1. It is impossible to experiment with absolutely *live* nerve.

2. Even were it strictly speaking a live nerve, yet it is sundered from its surroundings and is therefore not a normal nerve, nor is its action normal. Moreover, such is the intimate and intricate connexion of the whole nervous fibre, its coördinate, reflex, and even compensatory, inter-action and interdependence, that experiments upon excised nerves cannot command great confidence; reasoning from nerves under the scalpel to nerves in normal association and associated activity in the body must be received with caution.

3. The subjects of microscopic experiment must be brutes; here emerge two difficulties: 1st, The difficulty of sure interpretation of results; the experimenter must translate the motions of the brute into expressions of feelings. 2nd, Granting that he interprets the movement of muscle aright, still, it is brute feeling he is dealing with, he has no assurance of identity between this and the human being's, but the trustworthiness and value of his experiment depends upon such identity.

These difficulties inhering in the very nature of microscopic anatomy lie at the very basis and embarrass the investigator in the beginnings of the science; the uncertainties hence arising accompany every successive step of our progress.

Leaving this department and proceeding to the second division, the Correlation of Mind and Body, we are confronted with another obstacle. In investigating the Sensations and Presentations of Sense everything depends upon the persons conducting the experiments; here the analysis is largely subjective; how important then are the elements of attention, mental habits, powers of acute discrimination, etc., etc. The individual factor in all such calculations as are required in experiments must be conceded to be very large, very variable and exceedingly obscure; factors of bodily condition, constitutional idiosyncracies, attentiveness or distraction of mind, experience, practice, imaginative power; all these and the like form a personal equation of no mean influence in reaching results by experimentation.

Supposing, however, our basis in histology firmly established, so that we can confidently map out this wonderful geography of the nervous system into its appropriate tracts, with their afferent and efferent, their motor and sensory nerves; granting that our anatomy and physiology is accurate and thorough, still another difficulty meets us just at a critical and crucial juncture. Suppose we fix the rise of some molecular movement in peripheral stimulation, we may trace its progress with reasonable satisfaction and measurable assurance through its own realm, but when it crosses the boundary line from the physical into the psychical, who can follow it further save by inference? What scientific appliance can measure its impact upon mind? At this adytum the experimenter must pause in the presence of mystery as unfathomable to the philosopher as to the child, and acknowledge his ignorance. And yet he must enter this realm before he establishes any physiological psychology at all; to stop short of this territory would be to journey utterly in vain and waste his labor for naught.

When we think of such difficulties as these, and the uncertainty they must beget, we are tempted to think any attempt at the establishment of a complete science of physiological psychology premature in the present stage of knowledge; and yet we are glad that Professor Ladd has written his book; we have read every line of it and acknowledge ourselves his debtor, and we hope that many will do likewise. It is a noble subject and nobly treated. The work will benefit any man who will faithfully and patiently study it.

SAMUEL M. SMITH.

KEIL'S BIBLICAL ARCHEOLOGY.

MANUAL OF BIBLICAL ARCHEOLOGY. *By Carl Friedrich Keil, Doctor and Professor of Theology.* With alterations and additions furnished by the author for the English translation. Translated from the German (chiefly) by Rev. Peter Christie. Edited by the Rev. Frederick Crombie, D. D. Vol. I. New York: Scribner & Welford. 1887.

The teeming scholarship of Germany has of late poured upon us a multitude of books of various degrees of merit. Some of them we could well spare. But Keil's Biblical Archæology will be a standard work from the day of its appearance. Such a product of Continental learning is all too rare, and every conservative and thoroughgoing Bible student in America will recognize at once his obligations to the great publishing house which has placed within his reach a good English translation of it. We may say, too, in passing, that the solid binding and admirable letterpress furnish a setting no less worthy of this learned and substantial treatise than is the careful translation of Mr. Christie. The editor tells us in his Preface

that "great care has been taken to secure typographical accuracy, and it is hoped that very few errors of the press will be found." Certainly the book is an exceptional success in this respect; only one minute misprint has caught the attention of the present writer.

A scientific hand-book of Biblical Archæology has long been needed—only systematic students of the subject know how sorely. There is a large class of such students, for whom the excellent popular manuals of Barrows and others are too elementary, and for whose wants no adequate provision has ever before been made, notwithstanding the vast number and acknowledged value of our modern contributions to the department of Biblical Literature in general. But if the second volume of the work before us fulfils the promise of the first, it cannot much longer be said that there is no satisfactory manual of the subject in existence. As Dr. Crombie says in the Preface:

"The amount of information which the work contains is immense, and it must long remain the standard treatise in a scientific form on Biblical Archæology, irrespective altogether of Dr. Keil's views on the dates and origin of the books of the Bible. In no other work with which I am acquainted are to be found the same full and instructive criticisms on the opinions of Kurtz, Delitzsch, Hengstenberg, Riehm, and others who have written on Old Testament subjects relating to archæology."

The criticisms here referred to and deservedly commended, as well as the invaluable lists of literature with which the work is enriched throughout, are wisely relegated to foot-notes, which are not only exhaustive, but also surprisingly clear and direct, in view of the ordinary Teutonic indifference to these latter qualities of style. As to "Dr. Keil's views on the dates and origin of the books of the Bible," it is a positive relief to take up one German book on Old Testament study which is not either aflame with that fierce conflict or filled with more or less irreverent assumptions. Dr. Keil rarely refers to the Higher Criticism, and when he does it is to disallow the claims of the dominant schools in Europe. For instance, in alluding to the opinion of Hupfeld and others that the legislation of the Pentateuch with regard to festivals is obscure, contradictory and unhistorical, he says that "this opinion has been thoroughly refuted in *The Hebrew Feasts*, by W. H. Green of Princeton." Things have reached such a pass in Germany that it is by no means superfluous to commend the courage, modesty, and poise of a man who, though living in the very hot-bed of nineteenth century subjectivism, simply discusses these contents of Scripture in their historical order, without undertaking to convict the Biblical writers of ignorance or fraud.

As to the contents and arrangement, the author, after the technical Introduction, devotes a couple of chapters to the Scene of the Biblical History. Some years ago the *Independent*, in a sharp review of Dr. W. M. Thomson's *magnum opus*, ridiculed the idea that the location and structure of the Holy Land had any special significance. To Dr. Keil, however, it is gratifying to see, the position of Palestine, at once isolated and central, is full of significance. This unique country, with its compact area and cosmopolitan products was "preconfigured to its history" and sustained fundamental relations to the development of religion and the catholicity of Scripture. In these two chapters on the Geography, the treatment is more succinct, though hardly less thorough than elsewhere; but the author trips in identifying "the river of Egypt" (Gen. xv. 18) with the Nile, and commits the anachronism

of saying that the ancient Phœnicians made a harbor at Dor "by *blasting* the rocks and erecting walls from the stones thus obtained." How blasting was done in that day he of course omits to explain. He rejects a good many generally accepted derivations, *e. g.*, those of "Canaan" and "Merom." His method of transliteration is cumbersome by reason of a Russian excess of consonants, such that in *Dschebal Dschermak* we scarcely recognized our old friend Jebel Jermak.

But the main body of the book is occupied with a discussion of the first great division of Biblical Archeology, viz., the religious relations of the Israelites: (1), the places of worship—the tabernacle, the temples, the synagogues; (2), the *personnel* of worship—the Levites, the priests, the high priest; (3), the acts of worship—sacrifices, purifications and other sacred rites; (4), worship according to its times, festivals and changes. We are told that the translation of the second volume, which will deal with the more popular parts of Biblical Archæology, viz., the civil and social relations of the Israelites, is now in progress.

Dr. Keil's interpretation of the Old Testament symbols and types is not always satisfactory. He not only denies the piacular significance of the pre-Mosaic sacrifices, but he denies that all the bloody sacrifices of the Mosaic ritual were atoning. Now, according to our view, this is put beyond question by the fact that the symbolic transfer of guilt by the imposition of hands was common to all the bloody sacrifices. Dr. Keil, however, holds that in most cases the imposition of hands was not a symbol of the imputation of sin, but of the "transference of the disposition and intention that were at the time animating him who offered the victim to the *victim itself*", which, in virtue of this act of dedication, was supposed to assume the place of the worshiper and to embody the feelings and intentions in question." The reader will remember that the imposition of hands is interpreted for us in Lev. xvi. 21, "And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, *putting them upon the head of the goat*." Of course Dr. Keil admits that this was the import of the rite in this case and in the case of all sin-offerings; his mistake is in denying that this was also its primary import in the case of burnt-offerings and peace-offerings. That it meant more than this in the case of the latter we freely concede, but whatever additional meanings it had in particular cases, it always and everywhere meant primarily the expression and transference of guilt. Our author holds further, that the sprinkling of the blood meant only justification, which is inconsistent both with the logic and with the order of the clauses in 1 Peter i. 2—"*unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ*"—to say nothing of other objections. But, after all abatements for occasional error and infelicity of detail, it remains true that we have here on the whole the most orthodox, able and learned treatment of sacred antiquities that has yet appeared.

W. W. MOORE.

WARRENS' "PARADISE FOUND."

PARADISE FOUND: The Cradle of the Human Race at the North Pole. A study of the Prehistoric World. By William F. Warren, S. T. D., LL. D., President of Boston University, author of "*Einleitung in die Systematische Theologie*," etc. With Original Illustrations. Pp. 530. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1885.

Not many books deserve the comprehensive description of the book agent who said that the work he represented was "as interesting as a novel and as useful as an

encyclopædia," but it is true of the volume before us. Few novels have such a fascination of style and story; few reference books have such a wealth of information systematically presented. The reader is in a strait betwixt two—his temptation to devour the whole book at one sitting, to the exclusion of food and rest, and his disposition to linger over the absorbing details and explore the enticing vistas opening on every side. The book bristles with points. It is big with suggestions. Aglow with the eloquence of enthusiasm, it is tempered with the precision of science. The strange and beautiful theory advanced might easily betray the author into an occasional flight of tumid rhetoric but for the severe mental discipline resulting from his scientific studies, and evinced by his familiarity with the masters of patient research in every department.

So much, at least, we have thought it necessary to say by way of preparation for the statement that the object of this book is nothing less than to establish the following proposition:

The cradle of the human race, the Eden of primitive tradition, was situated at the North Pole, in a country submerged at the time of the deluge.

Let not the startled reader dismiss this hypothesis unexamined, as the vagary of another eccentric speculator, for, while we admit that the proposition has at the first blush a decided suggestion of Jules Verne, we nevertheless assure him that the contemptuous incredulity with which it is at first received will soon give place to a grave conviction that this theory is, after all, more powerfully supported than any yet propounded as to the site of the Garden of Eden. We are not here dealing with a wild visionary, but with a cool-headed man of science and a reverent student of Scripture. Hear him:

"This book is not the work of a dreamer. Neither has it proceeded from a love of learned paradox. Nor yet is it a cunningly-devised fable aimed at particular tendencies in current science, philosophy, or religion. It is a thoroughly serious and sincere attempt to present what is to the author's mind the true and final solution of one of the greatest and most fascinating of all problems connected with the history of mankind.

"That this true solution has not been furnished before is not strange. The suggestion that primitive Eden was at the Arctic Pole seems at first sight the most incredible of all wild and willful paradoxes. And it is only within the life-time of our own generation that the progress of geological discovery has relieved the hypothesis of fatal antecedent improbability. Moreover, when one considers the enormous variety and breadth of the fields from which its evidences of truth must be derived; when one remembers how recent are those comparative sciences on whose results the argument must chiefly depend; when one observes that many of the most striking of our alleged proofs, both in the physical and in the anthropological domain, are precisely the latest of the conclusions of these most modern of all sciences, it is easy to see that a generation ago the demonstration here attempted could not have been given."

"To the believer in Revelation, or even in the most ancient and venerable ethnic traditions, the volume here presented will be found to possess uncommon interest. For many years the public mind has been schooled in a narrow naturalism, which has in its world-view as little room for the extraordinary as it has for the supernatural. Decade after decade the representatives of this teaching have been measuring the natural phenomena of every age and of every place by the petty measuring-rod of their own local and temporary experience. So long and so successfully have they dogmatized on the constancy of nature's laws and the uniformity of nature's forces, that of late it has required no small degree of courage to enable an intelligent man to stand up in the face of his generation and avow his personal faith in the early existence of men of gigantic stature and of almost mil-

lenarian longevity. Especially have clergymen and christian teachers and writers upon Biblical history been embarrassed by the popular incredulity on these subjects, and not infrequently by a consciousness that this incredulity was in some measure shared by themselves. To all such, and indeed to all the broader-minded among naturalists themselves, a new philosophy of primeval history—a philosophy which for all the alleged extraordinary effects provides the adequate extraordinary causes—cannot fail to prove most welcome.”

Let us try to present a conspectus, inadequate as it must be, of the contents of this learned volume before commenting further on the conclusion reached. In Part First the author gives the state of the question, reviewing the results of explorers, such as Christopher Columbus and David Livingstone, who were avowedly searchers for lost Eden; the results of theologians, from the church fathers down; and the results of naturalists, ethnologists, and other classes of investigators, including even so late a work as Delitzsch's “Wo lag das Paradies?” The conclusion is expressed in the dictum of Ebers, that “the problem remains unanswered.”

In Part Second, believing with Tennyson that—

The golden guess
Is morning star to the full round of truth,

the author simply states the new hypothesis, and with the utmost candor admits that no other ever exposed itself to refutation at so many points, and shows that if false its rejection is inevitable, as it has to satisfy the conditions of seven different sciences.

In Part Third the theory is submitted successively to the tests of these seven sciences. Here it is shown that by the secular refrigeration of the earth the poles would be the first portions of the globe to become sufficiently cool, and consequently the first to afford the other conditions necessary for the support of life. The belief that there are six months of darkness at the pole is a popular delusion; atmospheric refraction reduces the arctic night to about eight weeks, during which, moreover, the heavenly luminaries march in horizontal orbits around this true centre of the world, and the Aurora Borealis fills the firmament with palpitating draperies and shining streamers and shifting curtains of light, as if the Creator had said, “There shall be no night there.” The Arctic Pole is preëminently the land of light. But the evidence that there was sufficient light for abundant life at the pole is not only inferential but direct, for, besides proving the existence and submergence of a circumpolar continent with a subtropical climate, geologists and botanists have shown that “all the floral types and forms revealed in the oldest fossils of the earth originated in the region of the North Pole, and thence spread first over the northern and then over the southern hemisphere, proceeding from north to south.” In like manner it is argued that there was a longitudinal distribution of animals also, the fossils showing that their prehistoric migrations were from north to south. In describing the irradiation of post-diluvian man from this mother region down the sides of the globe into the several continents at once, the occasion of which was “the mighty climatic revolution which came in with the glacial age,” President Warren fillips the Darwinians thus: “In our view the deterioration of natural environment reduced the vigor and longevity of the race; in theirs it changed one of the tribes of the animal world into men! Which of these views is the more rational may safely be left to the reader's judgment. Few will be disposed to accept the doctrine that man is simply a judiciously-iced pithecoïd.” The

conclusion drawn from these various tests is that on scientific grounds the theory of a polar paradise is not only admissible but probable.

In Part Fourth the author shows with a characteristic profusion of learning that the traditions of the oldest nations of the world, Japanese, Chinese, Hindus, Babylonians, Assyrians, Egyptians, and Greeks, invariably locate the cradle of the race in the distant north.

In Part Fifth the climax of interest is reached in a discussion of the survival in ethnic traditions of various peculiarities of an arctic Eden, *e. g.*, that the pole star was once in the zenith; that the primeval motion of the other stars was round a perpendicular axis—the ancient notion of a displacement of the sky, as if the polar dome had been tilted over about one-third of the distance from the zenith to the horizon, being accounted for by the translocation of man himself; that the sun formerly rose in the south; and that a day and a night made up a year. Many ancient religions and mythologies agree in “associating their Paradise-tree with the axis of the world, or otherwise with equal unmistakableness locating it at the Arctic Pole of the earth.” Further, ancient nations are unanimous in associating the abode of God with the North Pole. President Warren argues that the Hebrew conception was the same not only from such passages as Isa. xl. 22, but also from Psa. lxxv. 6, “Promotion cometh not from the east, nor from the west, nor from the south.”

“Why this singular enumeration of three of the points of the compass, and this omission of the fourth? Simply because heaven, the proper abode of the supreme God, being conceived of by all the surrounding nations, if not by the Hebrews themselves, as in the north, in the circumpolar sky, that was the sacred quarter, and it could not reverently be said that promotion cometh not from the north. It would have been as offensive as among us to say that promotion cometh not from above. Therefore, having completed his negative statements, the Psalmist immediately adds, ‘But God is the judge; he putteth down one and setteth up another.’”

In discussing the exuberance of life in this “circumpolar seed-plot of the whole earth,” the author reaffirms his belief in the record of Genesis concerning the extraordinary stature and longevity of primeval men. Such Biblical statements have been denied by some on the ground that all the human skeletons thus far found are only of ordinary size; but Dr. Warren reminds them that “none of these skeletons are from the high north,” points out the exceptional biological conditions of the original Eden, and cites wide-spread traditions of the deterioration of expatriated man. “Had the book of Genesis described one of the trees of Eden as three hundred and twenty feet in height and thirty feet in diameter at the base, not only all the Voltaires of modern history, but also, until the discovery of California, all naturalists of the advanced anti-christian variety, would have made no end of sport over the unscientific or mythical ‘Botany of Moses.’”

If President Warren’s idea of the Quadrifurcate River of Gen. ii. 10 seems fanciful, it must be remembered that no other theory has ever yet satisfied the language of that strange description. He conceives of the original river as a celestial stream, the rain from heaven, which fell upon the garden and then was divided into four main streams which flowed away in as many different directions to water the whole earth as “the rope of the world,” the Okeanos-river of the Greeks. At first sight the name “Euphrates,” applied to one of these divisions, seems fatal to the whole theory, as it apparently fixes the site of Gan-Eden somewhere in Mesopotamia or

Armenia. But, if so, does not the name "Gihon," borne by a historic water-course at Jerusalem, prove that Gan-Eden was in Palestine? The fact is, that various peoples have given the names of the Eden rivers to streams in their own countries; there is a "Euphrates" in Persia, and another in Africa, so that "Euphrates" proves nothing as to the site of Eden.

In Part Sixth the author discusses the significance of his results to students of biology, ancient literature, the origin and growth of religion, and the development of civilization. Students of Homer, from Mr. Gladstone down, admit that Dr. Warren has demolished the notion that the ancients believed the earth to be a flat disk.

Impatient of the sensationalism which is characteristic of the times, many will cast this book aside unexamined; all their conservative instincts revolt when this astounding and revolutionary theory is presented; and yet the work has a value apart from its main purpose, and President Warren is a real ally of conservatism on most questions. Evolution is his *bête noir*, and he deals the Darwinians some tremendous blows; in his concluding chapters he pulverizes the dogma of the primitive savagery of the human race; so far from admitting the claims of such critics as Kuenen and Wellhausen, he insists upon carrying the age of the composition of the Eden history backward instead of forward.

But, after all, we cannot adopt Dr. Warren's theory. Conclusive objections will occur to each reader in abundance. One may be mentioned by way of conclusion. No geologist has ever ventured to claim for man the enormous antiquity demanded by this theory. Dr. Warren not only carries back the origin of man to the tertiary period, but even to the miocene epoch. This would make the human race hundreds of thousands of years old. The fact that Dr. Warren does not accept extravagant estimates of geologic time does not meet this objection, for on any estimate a miocene Adam would be thousands of years older than the Biblical Adam, unless we throw the Biblical chronology overboard entirely. But this Dr. Warren cannot do, for, as he accepts the Biblical statements concerning the longevity of the antediluvians, he must accept the Biblical chronology also, since the latter is based upon the former.

The dilemma in which we have thus placed our author is typical and suggests a paradox by which we can describe in a nut-shell the whole of this brilliant performance: It is the argument of an uncompromising conservative for the most radical and fantastic theory ever proposed as to the location of Eden.

W. W. MOORE.

PRESSENSÉ'S STUDY OF ORIGINS.

A STUDY OF ORIGINS; or, The Problems of Knowledge, of Being, and of Duty.
By E. De Pressensé, D. D. Second edition. New York: James Pott & Co., Publishers. 1887.

This work, published in Paris in 1882, was speedily translated and republished, both in London and New York. The fact that in this country a second edition has already been called for shows that it has excited no little interest among thoughtful men—among thoughtful men, I say—for the book is not one intended for the hasty and superficial reader. Dealing, as it does, with some of the profoundest problems of philosophy, it deals with them in no superficial manner.

M. Pressensé has long been known to us as a leader in the evangelical movement in the Reformed Church of France, and an active member of the Evangelical Alliance. In 1854 he established the *Revue Chrétienne*, the organ of the evangelical party among French Protestants, and has edited it from that day to this. In this position, he has been compelled to grapple with rationalism, and "science, falsely so called," in all the forms in which they have assailed christianity, especially in France and Germany, during the last thirty years. That he has carefully studied these subjects, and rendered himself perfectly familiar with the anti-christian philosophy and science of our day, the work before us furnishes abundant proof.

His motive and purpose in writing his "Study of Origins," is set forth in the introduction in these words: "I am well assured that bad principles produce bad actions and bad institutions, because I have too high an idea, even of misguided man, not to believe that he *is* really as he *thinks*. A nation cannot be taught with impunity that the moral law is a mere fiction, that duty is but interest disguised, and that, apart from sensation, there is nothing. I am altogether lacking in the breadth of mind which regards these theories as indifferent or simply curious; to me they are deadly and degrading. If they were true, we must needs acquiesce in them; but life would then be nothing better than a miserable farce. Happily they are not true; they are gratuitous hypotheses which bewilder us only by their noisy repetition. They are contradicted by the most indisputable results of science and philosophy, not to speak of the rock of conscience on which they must ever split. This is what I have tried to show, taking as my authorities the greatest minds of the age." (P. xii.)

Such a work as M. Pressensé here proposes to himself necessarily covers a large field, and discusses many topics. Among these is "Religion, its Nature and Origin," a topic which he discusses with very marked ability. As setting forth the true nature of religion he writes: "All the avenues of the soul, so to speak, lead up to God himself. The metaphysical, the moral, the affective life, all that is bright, terminates in the divine; that is to say, there is no one of our faculties which is not, in its highest aspect, religious. And yet religion, in its essence, is not identical with any of these, and is not content to be merely their highest generalization. No; religion is in itself neither metaphysics, nor morals, nor æsthetics, nor mere emotion. The metaphysician may be mighty in establishing by argument the existence of a God, and yet may not be religious; the theologian may elaborate an admirable theodicy and yet be a profane man. An austere practical moralist may, with all his virtue, make God secondary to himself in his life, and only cherish, like the Stoics, a proud satisfaction in his own merits. No one will deny that the artist may make his canvas glow and breathe with a divine ideal, and yet, like Raphael, lay his art at the feet of a human idol. The heart may be rapt in mystical ecstasy and yet fail to fulfil the law of purity and holiness. Between sentimentality and charity the interval is often immense. Even devotion is not religion. Religion is something special, unique; it is, as its name indicates, the bond which unites man to God, the source of his being; it is the striving, the tending toward him. In a word, religion is life for God, with God, in God," pp. 437-'8. Of the distinctive character of a religion for man, he adds: "Looking at the manifestations of the religious feeling, as we find them universally over our world, one thing is certain and self-evident, and that is, that this feeling does not express merely the tendency to form and sustain a close relation with God, but also the painful and arduous effort

to restore that broken relation. Mankind is strongly possessed with the feeling that there is a Deity to be appeased; whether rightly or wrongly, it feels that it must get reconciled to this mysterious power. This is the meaning of those sacrificial altars reeking often with human blood, which we find in all lands; this is the burden of heathen rites, often cruel and abominable, but none the less expressing the human need of reconciliation and expiation, with an intensity of despair amounting almost to madness. How can we account for this tragic element of religion, which is not an accidental, transitory, intermittent fact, but one common to the race of man?" p. 444. To this question the only answer which can be given is, Man is a fallen creature; and his religion, even in its most debased form, contains some remnants of an original revelation from God.

Compare this account of the peculiarity in man's religion everywhere noticeable with that given by Herbert Spencer, who would have us believe that all religion is a product of evolution; and lest I should be charged with misrepresentation, I give Spencer's views in his own words: "As fast as the ghost-theory becomes established and definite, there grows up another kind of check upon immediate satisfaction of the desires—a check constituted by ideas of the evils which ghosts may inflict if offended; and when political headship gets settled, and the ghosts of dead chiefs, thought of as more powerful and more relentless than other ghosts, are especially dreaded, there begins to take shape the form of restraint distinguished as religious." (*Data of Ethics*, § 44.) This, it may be, is the best which a materialistic philosophy, having place in its creed for neither a soul in man nor a God above him, can do in the case; but how pitiful, even ludicrous, it appears when compared with that which christianity teaches us to give.

The extracts given above will enable the reader to form a correct idea of the tone and spirit in which the work under review is written. Few living men are better fitted, by long training, for the work undertaken in the "Study of Origins" than M. De Pressensé; and I think the verdict of every careful reader will be, the work is well done.

GEO. D. ARMSTRONG.

REED'S EVOLUTION VS. INVOLUTION.

EVOLUTION VERSUS INVOLUTION. A Popular Exposition of the Doctrine of True Evolution, a Refutation of the Theories of Herbert Spencer, and a Vindication of Theism. *By Arze Z. Reed.* New York: Zabriskie. 1885.

In the words of Mr. Reed: "It will be the effort of the author of this book to prove that God created the universe by an evolving process, and not by what is known as *special* or immediate creation. The former is just as much a creation as the latter, the only difference being that in the former it was done through the agency of innumerable secondary laws, and involves vast periods of time, whilst in the latter it was direct and instantaneous." (P. 31.)

What Mr. Reed means by "God's creating the universe by an evolving process" he subsequently further explains when arguing that such a creation gives us a higher conception of the power and skill of God than that of immediate creation does, in these words: "The mechanician who could make a machine that could itself make another, would justly demand a greater degree of admiration for his skill than he who had merely manufactured a simple machine. In the first instance, the author must not only take into account the perfect working of the first

contrivance as a simple machine, but he must so construct its complicated parts that it will, of its own working, produce another apparatus. Let us suppose the case of three men: A makes a very complicated machine for some particular purpose, and is much praised for his ingenuity and skill. B comes along, and to out-do A makes an apparatus that will make A's machine without any interference on his part. If we admired A's achievement and wondered at his skill, what shall we say of B's wonderful work? Another man, C, hearing of this wondrous machine, proceeds to invent an apparatus which will make A's machine, which, in its turn, will make B's machine, and this still another, without any interference from him. How shall we compare this last man's skill with that of the other two? Can there be a question as to which of these three men was the most skilful? Now, the evolutionist believes in a God who is sufficiently powerful to make laws which will make laws, and these others, and so on, until the whole universe is evolved." (P. 57.) In the book under examination the author dwells upon the grand conception of the power and skill of God which the doctrine of creation by evolution gives us, as illustrated above, as an argument which should commend it to the acceptance of thoughtful christian men. To this conclusion, I object:

1. The evolution which Mr. Rred advocates is irreconcilable with the christian doctrine of the providence of God; a doctrine most precious to the christian, and one which pervades the Scriptures from beginning to end. He gives to evolution the same wide range that Herbert Spencer does; and to its operation he ascribes the present condition of the nations of the earth and of the church of God as well. Chapter IX. of his book bears the title of "Sociogenesis, or the Evolution of Society," and of that chapter, section 4 is entitled, "Development of Governmental Institutions"; and section 5, "Development of Religious and Moral Institutions," and the contents of the chapter correspond to these titles. According to his teaching, existing civil and religious institutions are but the evolutes of previously existing ones. If this be so; if the church, for example, in its Abrahamic form was but a skilfully constructed machine which, in the course of time, ground out the church in its Mosaic form, and that in the same way originated the church in its christian form, what has the providence of God to do in all this operation? As a God of wonderful power and skill he may be seen away back in the beginning, planning and bringing into existence the church in its primordial form; but since then he can have had nothing to do with it; he has so constructed it that there is no occasion for further action on his part: indeed, any such action would seem to be an impertinent interference with his own perfect work. And this suggests—

2. A weighty objection to the doctrine of evolution, even within the limited range which Darwin assigns it, viz., that of organic nature. It may suggest, as Darwin himself says, grander conceptions of the power and skill of God than immediate creation does; but, practically, for all time since "the beginning," it banishes God from his universe. In the words of another, "Between Darwin's God of half an eternity ago, who woke just long enough to breathe life into a few material forms, or only one, and then fell into a slumber so deep that it has not been broken since, and the no-God of Haeckel, and the mysterious It of Spencer, there would really seem to be not much to choose. An infinite Creator, acting ordinarily through second causes, himself the moving principle of the universe he first framed, is, we suppose, a true conception, but this is not, logically and necessarily not, the Creator of the evolutionists. According to them the universe is essentially auto-

matic. For infinite years the Darwin divinity has given no signs of his existence, is practically non-existent, has ceased to be contemporary, if not dead is as good as dead. 'The Great Companion' is not, and we are left alone." (*A. Coles, M. D., LL. D., in Christian Thought for January, 1885.*)

Of the book as a whole I would say, like Darwin's "Origin of Species," it is more remarkable as an interesting collection of facts in the various departments of science, than for the soundness of the author's reasoning upon those facts; more remarkable for its erudition than its logic.

GEO. D. ARMSTRONG.

IX. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

UNIVERSAL BELIEFS; or, The Great Consensus. *By Rev. E. F. Burr, D. D., author of "Ecce Cælum," etc.* 12mo, pp. 312. Cloth, \$1.25. New York: American Tract Society. 1887.

The author traces through all the systems of religion and races of men that which is common, not with a view to showing that all religions are equally good, but to point out that which appears to be the universal belief of mankind. He is very far, therefore, from those advanced students of comparative religion who regard the religion of Christ as merely an evolution, its sacred Book a product of other sacred books, and its rites and ordinances relics of ancient ceremonies. The writer also seeks successfully to emphasize the points of agreement between the various denominations in existence, with a view to removing the too common excuse based upon their existence for neglecting personal religion. That there is a realm of superhuman beings; that at the head of this realm stands a Personal Being; that this Supreme Person is active in human affairs; that worship, public and private, is to be paid to him; that prayer may, in large degree, secure from him the blessings asked for; that he has sent infallible messages to man; that men possess immortal souls; that these souls are in ruin and need atonement; that there is a possibility of salvation, by a vicarious offering; and that the opportunity for such salvation does not extend beyond the present time: these are among the doctrines shown to be common to mankind. The book is a most wholesome and useful one, a valuable contribution to christian evidences.

NATURAL LAWS AND GOSPEL TEACHINGS. *By Herbert W. Morris, D. D., author of "Science and the Bible," "Testimony of the Ages," etc.* 12mo, pp. 195. New York: American Tract Society. 1887.

The author's object in this volume is to resist the attack made upon the christian faith by those who array the laws of nature against the laws and miracles of Christ, and the record of matter against the record of the Spirit. The first chapter is a careful presentation of the coincidence of the evangelists' statements with those of recent explorers in relation to the physical features, natural productions, cities and villages, streams and routes, of the land in which the scenes of the gospel were enacted, showing that the minute and perfect accuracy of the Scriptures as thus

tested should confirm our confidence in their truthfulness as to those matters in which we cannot test them. The nature of miracles, their necessity to christianity, the objections to them, the witnesses to them and their historic evidence, are considered. "Natural Laws and Answer to Prayer," "Natural Laws and the Resurrection of the Dead," and "Natural Laws and the Final Conflagration" constitute the subjects of the remaining chapters. The book is a safe one, practical, sensible, and sound. It will do to put into the hands of over-smart young men who imagine that they can overthrow every statement of the Bible by some of their fancied difficulties.

THE GIST OF IT: A Philosophy of Human Life. *By Rev. Thomas E. Barr, B. A.* With an Introductory Note by Rev. D. S. Gregory, D. D., ex-president of Lake Forest University. 12mo, pp. xxxiii., 350. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1887.

The skepticism which is now so prevalent affects none so seriously as that important class, the thoughtful young men of this generation. The object of this book is to direct such minds to a true philosophy as the basis of a true and manly life. While sometimes falling too much into the metaphysical style and argument so hard to avoid in such a treatise, the author usually happily escapes these, and though dealing with the profoundest principles of psychology, adapts his language to the understanding of those who lack technical training. The author is a young man, writing to young men. His work does not appear, however, as a tyro's, but as that of a finely-disciplined, philosophical mind, and of one who knows experimentally the needs of the special class for whom he writes. It will doubtless accomplish its end and lead many out of the shadows of skepticism, not only by argument that is clear and sound, but by pointing, as this book does, to the Sun of Righteousness, the Light of the world.

GUNETHICS; or, The Ethical Status of Woman. *By Rev. W. K. Brown, A. M., D. D., President Cincinnati Wesleyan College.* 12mo, pp. 162. 75 cts. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1887.

The author seeks in this volume to prove woman's title to all the rights and immunities bestowed upon man, both in church and state, the pulpit and the body politic. This he attempts by an exegesis of the Scriptures which he considers fair and cogent, but of the correctness of which there will be a multitude of questioners. Still the little book will be useful in showing what the advocates of the advanced theory on this subject think they can offer in support of their view.

CHURCH AND STATE IN THE UNITED STATES; or, The American Idea of Religious Liberty and its Practical Effects. With Official Documents. *By Philip Schaff, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary at New York.* 8vo, pp. 161. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1888.

This work is reprinted from papers of the American Historical Association, Vol. II., No. 4, and is designed as a contribution to American Church History, and to the centennial celebration of the national Constitution. The subjects it treats are the American Theory of the Relation of Church and State; the American System compared with other Systems; the Constitutional Basis of the American System, in the abolition of religious tests, and in the enactment of the First Amendment;

Action of the State Conventions; the Limitation of Religious Liberty—decision of the U. S. Supreme Court on Mormon Polygamy; the Charge of Political Atheism; the Infidel Program; the State Constitutions; Religious Liberty in the Creeds; Christianity and the Nation, in respect to Christian Legislation, the oath, exemption of church property from taxation, etc.; the Connecting Links between Church and State, in marriage, Sunday, and education. In addition, a number of official documents are appended, as decisions of the Supreme Court, opinions of judges, acts of Congress, etc. A cursory examination of the book would be injustice to its value and the importance of its contents. It is therefore reserved for special review.

SATURDAY OR SUNDAY: WHICH SHOULD WE OBSERVE? *By Rev. A. Rauschenbusch, Professor in the Rochester Theological Seminary.* 18mo, pp. 96. Paper, 10 cts. New York: American Tract Society. 1887.

In eight chapters the author gives an unanswerable argument for the observance of the first day of the week as the Christian Sabbath. He presents fairly, and as forcibly as his opponents themselves could, the arguments for the retention of the seventh day as the Sabbath, but shows clearly their weakness. The little book is heartily commended to all who desire a succinct, but exhaustive statement of the reasons and proof of the propriety of our observing the first day as the Sabbath.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK. *By the Very Rev. G. A. Chadwick, D. D., Dean of Armagh, author of "Christ Bearing Witness to Himself," etc.* Crown 8vo, pp. 446. Cloth, \$1.50. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1887.

THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL TO THE COLOSSIANS AND PHILEMON. *By Alexander Mac-laren, D. D.* Crown 8vo, pp. 493. Cloth, \$1.50. By the same publishers.

These two handsome volumes constitute the first instalment of "The Expositor's Bible," edited by the Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, editor of *The London Expositor*. The prospectus of this series of commentaries is most tempting, and these specimens of the general features of the work sustain the expectations aroused. The writers in the series are to be such men as Drs. Alexander Maclaren, Marcus Dods, W. B. Laikie, Principal Rainy, J. Monro Gibson, B. B. Warfield, and others, the foremost preachers and theologians of the day. The volumes are to be low-priced, yet most substantial, as we now have evidence. Think of it! to subscribers to the series, an admirable commentary of six volumes per annum for six dollars, and that from no cheap publishing house! The writers in this series will have due regard to scholarship, as their very names assure us, but the volumes will be essentially popular and adapted to general readers. Of the two before us we will only say at present that they are a full guarantee of the publishers' intention and desire to give us a scholarly, interesting, and in every way admirable commentary.

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. JOHN. With Exposition and Homiletical Treatment. *By the Rev. J. J. Lias, M. A., Vicar of St. Edward's, Cambridge, Late Hulsean Lecturer and Preacher at the Chapel Royal, Whitehall.* Pp. viii. 424. \$1.50. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. 1887.

This commentary, printed originally in the *Homiletic Magazine*, richly deserves the more permanent form given it in this handsome volume. It is a most delightful as well as scholarly work. The author carries the reader along so smoothly over

even the more critical parts that the latter appear as only so many mile-stones marking one's progress, or new starting points on the journey. He is independent, though without affectation or pedantry, earnestly contending for his views of the teaching of the apostle, even against Westcott, Alford, and Haupt. The book is thoroughly evangelical in spirit and sound in theology. The latter is especially shown in the expositions of such passages as i. 8, 10; ii. 1, 2; v. 1, and others, where the peccability of those who are born again, the perfection of Christ's atoning work, and the relation of faith to regeneration are discussed. The passage v. 7, 8, concerning the three witnesses, the author does not expound, not hesitating for a moment to believe its spuriousness. He gives, however, the leading arguments for its retention or rejection. The whole commentary is such delightful reading that it is hard to lay the book down till one has finished it.

THE PASTOR'S BIBLE. An Analysis of those Portions of Holy Scripture Pertaining to the Various Duties of the Pastor. *By Rev. E. C. Murray, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Summerville, S. C.* 16mo, pp. 217. Cloth, red edge, 75 cents. Richmond, Va.: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1888.

A hand-book for the use of pastors. Compact, and ready of reference, it will be found very useful. The selections have been carefully and judiciously made. The portion of scripture passages for use in pastoral visiting, and adapted to special exigencies, is particularly full and appropriate. A number of select hymns are added, at the end of the volume, all of them of the solid, well-approved type.

THE GOLDEN ALPHABET OF THE PRAISES OF HOLY SCRIPTURE, Setting Forth the Believer's Delight in the Word of the Lord; Being a Devotional Commentary upon the One Hundred and Nineteenth Psalm. *By C. H. Spurgeon.* 12mo, pp. 341. \$1. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1887.

The title of this volume is derived from the German designation of the Psalm treated as "The christian's golden A B C of the praise, love, power, and use of the word of God." This is a happy use of the form of the Psalm itself. The work is mainly extracted from "The Treasury of David," with which our readers are familiar, and is designed for those who find the author's entire commentary too costly or bulky. As in his other works, the commentator has here sought, with characteristic success, to promote devotion rather than display learning. The book is to be strongly commended for its richness of thought, quaint illustrations and thorough spirituality.

ABIDE IN CHRIST: Thoughts on the Blessed Life of Fellowship with the Son of God. *By Rev. Andrew Murray.* Forty-eighth thousand. Pp. 223. And

LIKE CHRIST. A sequel to the above. *By the same.* Twenty-second thousand. Pp. 256. 12mo. \$1 each. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. 1887.

These volumes constitute a double series of meditations, one for each day of the month, that are thoroughly spiritual and devotional. The first sets forth the nature of our union with Christ, the sense of his presence, and the coöperation and fruit-bearing which come from union with him; the second, the practical subject of Christ-likeness, that likeness which springs from abiding in him.

THE GOSPEL STORY; or, The Life of Christ for the Little Ones. 16mo. Cloth. Pp. 303. With sixteen full-page illustrations. 60 cents. Richmond, Va.: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1887.

This little book is truly what it claims to be, "The Gospel Story," told in an exquisitely simple and direct manner, for the smallest children. As far as possible it uses the words of the gospels, but always avoids those hard to be understood. Parents and the teachers of the smaller or infant classes in Sabbath-schools will find it most helpful.

DAILY TRUTH: Selections from Holy Writ for Every Day in the Year. *By H. Bickersteth Cook.* With a preface by the Bishop of Exeter. 1 Vol., *Morning*; 1 Vol. *Evening.* Cloth, \$1.00 for the two. London: Suttaby & Co.; New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1887.

As dainty little volumes as have ever been issued, and with most admirable selections for daily reading of the Scriptures, morning and evening.

THE BEST BREAD, and other sermons preached in 1887. *By C. H. Spurgeon.* 12mo, pp. 393. \$1.00. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1888.

Nothing new can be said of this great gospel preacher. His eloquence, ability, soundness and piety are already known throughout the world. His present attitude towards the Baptist Union, however, and his fearless testimony against the so-called broad views prevailing around him, will make this new volume of sermons the more interesting and helpful to all who think with him. The appearance of this volume gives us the welcome opportunity to state, without request or suggestion from any one, that, notwithstanding there exists no international copyright, the American publishers of Spurgeon's sermons have evidently most abundantly satisfied and pleased the great English preacher, since he writes them, under date of January 30th, 1888: "I am glad that you, Robert Carter & Brothers, are not only publishers of my sermons, but true and generous friends, with whose conduct I am more than satisfied. You can publish this note; indeed, I trust you will do so largely." All honor and praise to the honest publishers!

FOUR CENTURIES OF SILENCE; or, From Malachi to Christ. *By the Rev. R. A. Redford, M. A., LL. B., Professor of Systematic Theology, New College, London.* Second edition. 12mo, pp. 258. Cloth, \$1.50. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. 1887.

This volume, as the author says, is not the setting forth of a history so much as the characterizing of a period. It is composed of a series of papers which first appeared in *The Homiletic Magazine*. The author presents and discusses most lucidly the state of the Jewish church during the period between the Old and New Testaments, and shows the bearing of different features of the national and ecclesiastical life upon the preparation for the higher revelations of christianity. To accomplish this end, he treats exhaustively such subjects as "The Septuagint," "The Apocryphal Writings," "The Scribes and their Traditions," "The Rise of Jewish Sects," etc. The book is a valuable one, affording in most attractive form a large amount of information concerning a period and events and conditions which are too little known. A popular work on the "connexion" has long been a desideratum. It is furnished here.

PALESTINE IN THE TIME OF CHRIST. *By Edmond Stapfer, D. D., Professor in the Protestant Theological Faculty of Paris.* New American Edition from English Plates. 8vo, pp. xii., 527. Cloth, \$2.50. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son.

This valuable work well deserves the praise given previous editions. It is full and comprehensive, and well supplied with indices, bibliography, table of scripture passages quoted, etc. The first book deals with the geography of the Gospels, the Herods, the Sanhedrim, administration of justice, population, home life, dwellings, clothing, public life, life in country districts, literature and the arts and sciences. The second book presents the religious life of Palestine, the Pharisees and Sadducees, Hillel and Shammaï, doctors of the law, schools, philosophy, the preaching of the Pharisees, the synagogue, Sabbath, the Bible, purifications, fasts, almsgiving, prayer, feasts, etc. As stated in the title, these are considered solely with reference to the time of Christ, the epoch when the old was done away with and the new form was introduced which was to become the substitute for Judaism. The book will be found most useful for reference as well as for reading. The New Testament, the writings of Josephus, the Talmuds, the Mishnah, and other records of Jewish history and tradition are the sources from which the author draws.

THE TALMUD; What it is, and What it Knows about Jesus and His Followers. *By Rev. Bernhard Pick, Ph. D.* Pp. 147. Cloth, 50 cents. New York: John B. Alden. 1887.

This little book affords a large amount of valuable information concerning what Dean Milman called "that wonderful monument of human industry, human wisdom, and human folly," the Talmud. In the first part of the book, the author endeavors to show what the Talmud is, by giving a succinct history of the development of Jewish traditionalism, which culminated in the Talmud; and in the second part to indicate what it has to say about Jesus, the gospels and christian customs, which can only be understood by the light of the New Testament. The volume will be found of special value to ministers and theological students.

THE CRISIS OF MISSIONS. *By Rev. A. T. Pierson, D. D.* 16mo, pp. 376. Paper, 35 cents. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1887.

The publishers are to be thanked and the public congratulated upon the appearance of a very cheap edition of this most valuable book. The work deserves the immense sale it has had. Every page of it is fascinating, stimulating, instructive.

ABRAHAM: HIS LIFE AND TIMES. *By Rev. William J. Deane, M. A., Rector of Ashen, Essex.*

MOSES: HIS LIFE AND TIMES. *By George Rawlinson, M. A., Professor Oxford University, Author of "The Five Great Monarchies," etc.*

SOLOMON: HIS LIFE AND TIMES. *By Rev. F. W. Farrar, D. D., F. R. S., Archdeacon and Canon of Westminster, etc.* Each, 12mo, pp. about 200. \$1. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co.

These volumes belong to a series called "The Men of the Bible," which Messrs. Randolph & Co. are issuing, under an arrangement with the English publishers. The three above named, with one other, have already appeared. They are as inter-

esting as a story book. The authors have not given the meagre outlines found in the Scriptures but have woven into the life of these great characters contemporary events and details of custom, language, association and religion, in such a manner as not only to add interest to the men whose lives they portray but also to instruct the reader. This is particularly noteworthy in Rawlinson's "Moses," not so much because of his greater felicity of style or wonderful familiarity with the history and lore of Moses' day, as because the commanding figure of Moses and the thrilling experiences of Israel in his day, and the wonderful resources of Egyptian history afford the richest imaginable field for so accomplished a writer. The other volumes of the series, now in preparation, will be by authors equally well known for scholarship and attractiveness of style.

A HISTORY OF THE INQUISITION OF THE MIDDLE AGES. *By Henry Charles Lea, author of "An Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy," etc.* In three volumes. Vols. I. and II. Royal 8vo. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1888.

These splendid volumes, to be followed very soon by a third, will form the standard authority upon the subject of the Inquisition for many years to come. The author is qualified for his work by previous writings and study, by diligent research and painstaking effort. His purpose is not so much to express his opinion of the important events and their causes which he describes, as to present them and leave them to teach their own lesson. He regards the history of the Inquisition as dividing itself into two parts, with the Reformation as the dividing line, and this work deals with the earlier part. In the first volume he treats of the Origin and Organization of the Inquisition, and in the second, the Inquisition in the several Lands of Christendom. His view is that the Inquisition was not an organization arbitrarily devised and imposed upon the judicial system of Christendom by the ambition or fanaticism of the church, but a natural, one may almost say an inevitable, evolution of the forces at work in the thirteenth century. To prove this position his first volume consists largely of a review of the spiritual and intellectual movements of the middle ages, and the condition of society, as factors in the development of this ecclesiastical product. Many will not agree with this theory in full, perhaps. There is no question, however, but that, if it were mere priestly ambition or ecclesiastical fanaticism that gave rise to the Inquisition, these availed themselves of the rare opportunity furnished by the state of society and religious thought and expression to accomplish their fell designs. If ambition and fanaticism founded the horrid scheme, the "environment" was most favorable to its development and application.

The author's studies and presentation of facts are of special value at the present day. The bold assertion of Rome, and especially of her sworn subjects in America, that she is not an enemy to civil or personal liberty, needs to be set beside the facts of her past history, and, with their baleful light upon it, interpreted by her great principle, her glory, "*Rome never changes.*"

MARTIN LUTHER. His Life and Work. *By Peter Bayne, LL. D.* Two volumes. 8vo. London and New York: Cassell & Co., Limited. 1887.

In no respect was the Reformation period more remarkable than as to the personal character and qualifications of the men whom God raised up for the special work. Luther, Melancthon, Zwingli, Farel, Calvin, Knox and others, were men

such as the world has rarely seen. They were brought forth for the times in which they lived. The study of their lives, of the surroundings that moulded their character and of the circumstances which led them to throw off the heavy yoke that Rome had placed upon the necks of men and governments, is therefore the study of the Reformation itself.

The student of that period will find in these superb volumes a fine contribution to the personal history of that great movement. And yet it is not simply a biography which the author gives. His object is more philosophical. He would trace the influence of the great reformer upon his times, and set him forth as in some measure the embodiment of the mighty principles for which he contended. To this end the chronological order of events is not so closely followed in this work as the relation of Luther's life to the development of the forces which wrought the great spiritual revolution in Germany. These volumes are full of interest in their delineation of the life and character of their subject, and will greatly aid the reader in understanding the issues of Luther's day.

THE MISSING SENSE, and the Hidden Things which it Might Reveal: Spiritual Philosophy treated on a Rational Basis. *By C. W. Wooldridge, B. S., M. D.* 16mo, pp. 97. 60 cents. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1887.

This book is decidedly in advance of "Psychic Studies," recently published by the same firm. It is a bold attempt to first show, from observed facts and reason, the existence and reality of spiritual intelligence 'apart from matter, and then to examine the functions and scope of spirit and the relations of the present life to the life beyond. It is full of speculations, curious, "advanced" and far from credible.

A PHOTOGRAPHIC FAC-SIMILE OF THE 1623 FOLIO EDITION OF SHAKESPEARE. 926 pages. Cloth, \$2.50. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1887.

This is an exact reproduction, to the minutest detail, of the original, with pages reduced to crown 8vo size. To those who cannot afford to purchase the original at the price which a copy lately cost Lady Burdett-Coutts, \$3,500, this *fac-simile* will be quite as useful for the purpose of tracing the peculiar punctuation, bracketing, odd spelling and paging, and the cipher which it is claimed lies concealed in this first folio edition. The *fac-simile* edition is a credit to the enterprise of the great house from which it is issued.

ALDEN'S MANIFOLD CYCLOPEDIA. Vol. IV. Cloth, 50 cents; half morocco, 65 cents. New York: John B. Alden. 1888.

A combination of unabridged dictionary and cyclopædia, this work promises to be one of wonderful convenience. The fourth volume amply fulfils the expectation caused by the character of those preceding it, which have already been noticed.

THE STORY OF THE EARTH AND MAN. *By Sir J. W. Dawson, LL. D., etc.* New edition, with corrections and additions. Pp. 196. Paper, 15 cts.; cloth, 40 cts. New York: John B. Alden. 1887.

This is a cheap edition, for popular use, of Principal Dawson's well-known treatise on geology. We can only repeat the commendation of it given at length in the January QUARTERLY.

THE PLANETARY AND STELLAR WORLDS. A Popular Exposition of the Great Discoveries and Theories of Modern Astronomy. *By General O. M. Mitchell.* Pp. 183. Paper, 15 cts.; cloth, 30 cts. New York: John B. Alden. 1887.

In similar shape, binding and type with Dawson's *Story of the Earth and Man*, this book is admirably adapted to be a companion volume. Gen. Mitchell's well-known work needs no commendation. No American ever did more to popularize astronomy. Though written many years ago, and perhaps in some respects not up to the more recent advancements of the science, the book is still fresh and interesting.

POEMS. *By Marietta Holley.* Illustrated by W. Hamilton Gibson and others, 8vo, pp. 216. \$2.00. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1887.

Marietta Holley is better known to the general public as "Josiah Allen's Wife." Unlike her other works, that before us is not of a humorous nature. In her poems, however, one will find the same strong common-sense and deep insight into character which underly her very popular and useful prose writings. In fact, these traits, which give strength and force to her humor, are somewhat adverse to complete success in the purely sentimental, imaginative sphere of the poetical. The reader will by no means be disappointed, however, with all of the poems, for there are many which are tender and beautiful. Miss Holley's reputation will receive deserved increase from this volume.

THE MISSIONARY REVIEW OF THE WORLD. Editors: J. M. Sherwood, New York, and Arthur T. Pierson, Philadelphia. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. \$2 per year.

The recent appearance of this monthly review justifies a special notice of it. The publication is a continuation, in greatly enlarged form and under new auspices, of that conducted by Rev. Mr. Wilder, of Princeton, under the title, *The Missionary Review*. The new form presents the subject of missions under seven heads: The Literature of Missions; Organized Missionary Work; Correspondence and General Intelligence; International Department; Monthly Concert; Monthly Bulletin of Progress and Results; Statistics. The three numbers which have appeared justify the expectation that this review will be both able and interesting, and of great usefulness to the church at home and abroad. That Dr. Pierson, the author of "The Crisis of Missions," is one of its editors guarantees this.

Put next
Ches.
THE
PRESBYTERIAN
QUARTERLY.

EDITORS: G. B. STRICKLER, D. D.; E. H. BARNETT, D. D.

MANAGER: GEORGE SUMMEY, CHESTER, S. C.

VOL. II. JULY, 1888. No. 2.

- I. THE CONTRA-NATURAL CHARACTER OF THE MIRACLE. John L. Girardeau, D. D., LL. D.
- II. THE UNCHANGEABLE WORD. T. W. Hooper, D. D.
- III. ANTI-BIBLICAL THEORIES OF RIGHTS. Robt. L. Dabney, D. D., LL. D.
- IV. THE SPIRIT OF PRESBYTERIANISM. J. A. Waddell, D. D.
- V. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF HEBREW POETRY. John H. Thomas.
- VI. NOTES:
Dabney's Refutation of the Sensualistic Philosophy; But What Next? James McCosh, D. D., LL. D.
Bible Study in College—Methods. J. B. Shearer, D. D.
The General Assembly of 1888. L. G. Barbour, D. D.
The Northern General Assembly. T. A. Hoyt.
The Centennial Celebration in Philadelphia. A. B. Curry.
Exclusion of the Bible from the Public Schools. Thos. E. Barksdale.
- VII. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS: By H. C. Alexander, Samuel N. Smith, B. B. Warfield, James F. Latimer, G. A. Blackburn, R. A. Webb and Geo. D. Armstrong.
- VIII. NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

CHESTER, S. C.:

MANAGER "PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY."

NEW YORK: ANSON D. F. RANDOLPH & Co.

\$3.00 PER YEAR.

80 CENTS PER SINGLE NUMBER.

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY

IS UNDER THE SUPERVISION AND CONTROL OF AN ASSOCIATION
COMPOSED OF THE FOLLOWING MINISTERS:

GEO. D. ARMSTRONG, D. D., LL. D.; E. H. BARNETT, D. D.; JOHN F. CANNON, D. D.; WM. C. CLARK; J. N. CRAIG, D. D.; A. B. CURRY; ROBT. L. DABNEY, D. D., LL. D.; JNO. L. GIRARDEAU, D. D., LL. D.; C. R. HEMPHILL, D. D.; C. C. HERSMAN, D. D.; T. W. HOOPER, D. D.; C. W. HUMPHREYS; ISAAC J. LONG, D. D.; A. W. MILLER, D. D.; W. W. MOORE, D. D.; B. M. PALMER, D. D., LL. D.; THOS. E. PECK, D. D., LL. D.; J. B. SHEARER, D. D.; SAMUEL M. SMITH; R. K. SMOOT, D. D., LL. D.; G. B. STRICKLER, D. D.; ROBERT A. WEBB; T. D. WITHERSPOON, D. D., LL. D.

THE QUARTERLY will endeavor to represent the views and literature of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, and to promote the interests of the Church in all her relations and departments of work.

An opportunity will be given in its pages for the fair and impartial discussion, within limits, of the great questions of the day.

Each number will contain one or two distinctively theological or philosophical articles, with others of a more popular character. In a separate department of Notes, the effort will be made to give brief discussions of matters of present moment, and in such form as to be of special value to the thinking people of the Church outside the ranks of the ministry.

Special attention will be given to current literature; and critical notices, full rather than numerous, of the most valuable new books will be prepared by men specially trained in the several departments of learning or work to which they belong.

A large number of articles on timely and important subjects has been engaged, and the patrons of the QUARTERLY may confidently expect it to be kept up to a high standard of ability and timeliness.

Each writer is responsible for the views expressed in his article, and ordinarily the author's name will be appended.

Address all communications, mss., etc., to the Manager, Chester, S. C.

Copyright, 1888.
George Summey, Manager.

Entered as second-class matter
at the Post-office, Chester, S. C.

Whittet & Shepperson, Richmond, Va., Printers.

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 5.—JULY, 1888.

I. THE CONTRA-NATURAL CHARACTER OF THE MIRACLE.

NONE but the maintainers of a rigid process of evolution, enforced by a law of blind, immanent necessity, would deny that man has degenerated from his primitive condition. He has fallen from the estate of holiness and happiness in which he was created into one of sin and misery. That being admitted, it is obvious that the scheme of religion which he originally possessed is now utterly inadequate to his wants. The law which it contained as a rule of action has been violated, and its condemning sentence renders impossible an acceptable obedience to its requirements. So far as that scheme of religion is concerned man is doomed.

On the supposition that God the Moral Ruler were willing to reveal to sinful man another scheme, not merely legal but redemptive, as a directory of faith, a guide of life and a basis of hope, it would be just, if not indispensable, that its credentials should be so clear as to admit of no reasonable doubt. They ought to be not so much deductions from speculative premises however apparently well-founded, as phenomenal facts easily apprehended by consciousness, or immediate and necessary inferences from those facts, and therefore of equal validity with the original data themselves: the concrete results of observation and experience, or good because logical consequences from them. While the revelation itself is to be proved, its proofs ought to be as nearly as possible autopsistic.

But it is not only necessary that they be clear: they should also be striking. It may be laid down as a maxim, that an extraordinary interposition of the divine will, affecting the religious interests of mankind, should be authenticated by correspondingly extraordinary proof. Reason is entitled to entertain this expectation on two grounds: *First*, that the danger of deception by imposture in matters of so vital an importance may be rendered impossible—a danger to which, it must be confessed, history furnishes mournful and abundant evidence that the race is peculiarly exposed; and, *secondly*, that the certainty of faith and of eternal hopes may be based upon an impregnable foundation. The religious element, involving a belief in the supernatural, is so firmly imbedded in the human constitution that, even if it be pitched out with the fork of a perverse speculation, it is sure to return. It has often been remarked that the rejectors of the Bible are, generally speaking, most liable to become the victims of a superstitious credulity. Suppressing faith in the true supernatural revealed in the Scriptures, they subject themselves to the vagaries of the false. Liable, then, as men are to be imposed upon by deceptive evidences of supernatural intervention, they need clear and extraordinary proof that a revelation professing to come from God is in reality what it claims to be. This reasonable expectation God has in fact complied with, and has satisfied it, by furnishing *miracles*, as unmistakable evidences of a supernatural revelation of his will concerning the salvation of men. Miracles do afford clear and extraordinary proof of an extraordinary interposition of God in relation to man's religious interests.

The importance of miracles, therefore, cannot be exaggerated. It is against them that the most subtle and powerful assaults of scepticism have been directed, under the influence of a sagacious judgment that their demolition would involve the overthrow of christianity itself. When the shout is, Down with miracles! the meaning is, Down with the Bible! and Down with the Cross! And this is no mistake. The foes and the friends of christianity concur in emphasizing their significance. Strauss said that he despaired of overthrowing the influence of the christian ministry until faith in miracles shall be extirpated from the minds of the

people. Hurst, in his "History of Rationalism," forcibly declares that "no branch of scriptural faith attracted more of the wrath and irony of the Rationalists than miracles;" and Christlieb puts the case with equal truth and strength when he remarks, "However much in other respects our opponents may differ, they all agree in the denial of miracles, and unitedly storm this bulwark of the christian faith; and in its defence we have to combat them all at once. But whence this unanimity? Because with the truth of miracles the entire citadel of christianity stands or falls."

The two questions which will now be discussed are: *First*, What is a miracle? What is the nature of this extraordinary credential of a supernatural revelation? *Secondly*, Can it be shown that all the evidences in favor of supernatural revelation, so far as their principal features are concerned, are reducible to unity upon the miracle? Are all the departments of the evidence, in the main, miraculous in their character?

I. What, then, is a miracle?

The highest genus under which it comes is event—it is an event. The proximate genus is wonderful event—a miracle is a wonderful event. Its specific marks, differentiating it from other wonderful events, are: *first*, that it is a contravention of the known course of nature; and *secondly*, that it accompanies the teaching of a person claiming to be commissioned by God, or a revelation professing to be divine and intended to promote human holiness.

A miracle, then, may be defined to be a wonderful event, contravening the known course of nature, and accompanying the teaching of a person claiming to be commissioned by God, or a revelation professing to be divine, and intended to promote human holiness. The miracle is here defined from its nature and its office. Clearness and completeness require the incorporation into the definition of these elements.

As has already been shown, no event short of wonderful could be an unimpeachable proof of an extraordinary interposition of God. But wonderful events may be brought to pass by power less than divine. The sort of wonderful event, therefore, which is alone competent to attest an extraordinary divine interposition is one which, from the nature of the case, must transcend the power of

mere creatures. It must be one which cannot be produced by the devil or any combination of devils, or by a human being or any combination of human beings, or by any combination of devils and human beings. If it could be produced in either of these ways, the proof would be lacking that God is its author; and consequently the revelation in the interest of which it is adduced could not be proved to be from God alone. But if a revelation claiming to be divine is attested by events which it is competent to God only to produce, his approbation of the claim is clearly established. And since he cannot uphold a lie or endorse a fraud, the proof is irrefragable that the professed revelation is of divine origin, and is authoritatively true.

The question, then; is, What kind of event would fulfil this requirement? The answer is, that as an infraction of the known laws, or a contravention of the known course, of nature cannot, for obvious reasons, be wrought by human beings, and when produced for the purpose of promoting holiness would not be wrought by devils, an event involving these elements is manifestly to be attributed to the sole efficiency of God. If, then, a professedly supernatural revelation is proved by events of that character, its credentials are indisputable. To this apparently necessary view of the proofs of a revelation claiming to be divine objections have been offered by the most dissimilar parties, and have been pressed by some theistic, and even christian, writers with a zeal for which it is difficult to account. The most prominent of them will be subjected to a brief examination.

1. It is objected that this view of the miracle represents God as acting inconsistently with himself. As the laws by which he governs the world are expressions of his will, that will is held to contradict itself. To this the answer is obvious upon several grounds:

(1.) Using law as a compendious term for the regular operation of any one force of nature, or of more than one force in combination with each other, we cannot fail to observe that nothing is more common than the resistance and counteraction of one law by another. Of so frequent occurrence is this fact, that illustration would be unnecessary and gratuitous. It commends itself to ob-

servation at every moment. It is very strange that this opposition of law to law, by which the checks and balances of the physical system are maintained, and without which that system would be reduced to chaos by the unlimited and excessive operation of one or more forces, should be made a ground of objection to the miracle conceived as a contra-legal event. As every law is a special mode in which the divine will expresses itself, and every such exponent of that will is, to the most ordinary observation, liable to be resisted and held in check by another special mode in which the same will energises, will it be contended that God is inconsistent with himself? Will it be said that the whole system of nature affords an exhibition of divine self-contradiction? Or rather is it not true that this complex of special antagonisms of law to law contributes to the harmonious action of the whole, and the production of a general end which, as far as we can see, could in no other way be secured? It is evident, therefore, that it can be no valid objection to the miracle that, because it is affirmed to involve a contravention of some law, it would suppose the inconsistency of God with himself. For, simply in this aspect of it, it is sustained by the whole analogy of nature. The miracle is not a wonderful event, merely because it furnishes an instance of contradiction to law. It is wonderful, for the reason that a law is contradicted, not by another known law, but a new and exceptional force, exerted apart from any ordinary force of nature.

It may be urged that it is in this respect, in which the miracle is wholly singular and peculiar, that it is exposed to the objection that it makes God inconsistent with himself. But this does not really change the state of the question. The only difference between the two cases is that in one the divine power is mediately, in the other immediately, exercised. In both cases the element exists of the contradiction of one force by another. In both, the forces which operate express the power of God. And how in one case the resistance of one force by another is reconcilable with the divine consistency, while in the other it is not, it is impossible to see. Grant that in each the divine power is the real agent, at least that from which the force is derived, which no theist will deny, and no difference worth mentioning exists between them in

this regard. In one, God mediately contradicts, in the other, he immediately contradicts, a physical law. The conclusion is that in neither, or in both, is he inconsistent with himself.

There are two forms, deserving attention, in which an *a fortiori* argument may here be pressed. In the first place, if there be inconsistency on the part of God in opposing an exceptional force to some law of nature, much greater would be the inconsistency of resisting the regular and systematic operation of a law by the equally regular and systematic operation of another law, for example, of the centrifugal by the centripetal force. The objector, therefore, would be logically bound to consider God more inconsistent with himself in the usual course of nature than in the occasional employment of a miraculous force. The former, upon his supposition, would imply habitual, the latter infrequent, inconsistency on God's part. The objection rebounds upon him who offers it. In the second place, if God is consistent with himself in entirely abrogating some of his laws which possessed a moral and religious significance, much more may he be regarded consistent with himself in occasionally contravening a physical law by a physical force. The distinction between moral and positive laws—a distinction signalized even in human law under the terms *malum in se* and *malum prohibitum*—is too familiar to require in this place extended elucidation. It needs, however, to be stated, to secure clearness and prevent misapprehension. These two kinds of law are not defined from the ends which they contemplate. Both the moral and the positive suppose moral ends. They receive their specific denomination from their respective grounds. A moral law is grounded in the eternal nature of God, a positive in his will as expressing the divine determinations. Bishop Ezekiel Hopkins has tersely embodied the distinction in the words: A thing may be commanded because it is right; a thing may be right because it is commanded. It is therefore clear that a moral law is one which cannot be repealed. Its revocation, were it possible, would involve God in inconsistency with himself. And were it maintained that a miracle is a contravention of moral law, the position would be fairly liable to the objection under consideration. But no such ground is taken. The miracle is viewed as having no

such relation to the moral laws which God has ordained, as to furnish a contradiction of them. This must be borne in mind, or the discussion becomes utterly confused.

But we have scriptural testimony to the fact that God has abrogated some of his positive laws. The change from the scheme of natural religion to the gospel, and the change from the Mosaic dispensation of the gospel itself to the christian, embraced a repeal of positive laws. The reënactment of the Moral Law amidst the solemnities of Sinai was accompanied by no reënforcement of the specific law in regard to the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, which was a test of obedience to man in his primeval estate. That law was abrogated. The laws which so stringently bound upon the Jew the obligation to offer animal sacrifices, and in general to observe the ritual ordinances of the Mosaic economy, were repealed at the inauguration of the christian. These laws, although positive, operated in the moral and religious sphere, and were designed to secure corresponding ends. If, now, God was not inconsistent with himself in completely abrogating those laws, much less can he be regarded as acting out of harmony with his perfections in contravening, at some particular juncture, without absolutely destroying, the laws of the mere physical system. The same argument would hold also with reference to the change of the sacraments of the respective dispensations, the revocation of the law concerning the observance of circumcision and the pass-over, and the enforcement of that respecting baptism and the Lord's supper. This view is enhanced by the consideration that not only, in these instances, was there the abrogation of particular laws, but of whole systems of law. Were the naked requirements of the original scheme of moral law, which knew nothing of atonement for sin, not revoked, so far as the obligation to personal obedience resting upon the mere human subject is concerned; were not the law of faith substituted for the law of works, no member of the race could be justified and saved. And that the whole system of ritual law, which was specifically characteristic of the Mosaic dispensation, has been repealed by God's authority, could, were it necessary, be easily proved from the immortal speech of Stephen, the elaborate arguments of the New Testament epistles, and the

historic usages of the christian church. If God could, consistently with himself, annul, in certain respects, whole schemes of law possessing a religious significance, why could he not, with like self-consistency, contravene, under certain limitations, some special laws of nature? These *a fortiori* arguments must be met by one who takes exception to the contra-legal feature of the miracle on the ground that it would involve the Almighty Ruler in inconsistency with himself. They are based on facts which cannot be countervailed by *a priori* considerations, however specious.

(2.) The objection proceeds upon a fallacious assumption in regard to the immutability of God. If the miracle, as here defined, supposed a change in the essence, or the perfections, or the purposes of the Eternal Being, the definition would bear its refutation upon its face. But while we maintain, as maintain we ought, the unity and unchangeableness of God, we ought not to sink out of view the mysterious fact of the manifoldness of his intelligence and the almost boundless variety of his operations. While his nature remains eternally one and immutable, it is also the ground and the origin of change in all that is not itself. The universe teems with changes. Whence the conception of them if not in the infinite mind of its author? Whence the effectuation of them, so far, at least, as they are not the free sinful acts of moral creatures—the effectuation of them as physical, if not by his infinite will and his almighty power? The very existence of the universe is itself an instance of a transcendent change. Unless we take the atheistic ground that the universe is eternal, we are obliged to admit that there was a period of duration in which it did not exist. It began to be. However inconceivable to thought the fact of creation may be, it is a datum of faith. There was a moment, then, when out of nothing something came. At this supreme crisis of creation, the objects about which forces, and laws as the generalized expression of the operations of forces, are concerned, passed from non-being into being. Here, then, was the origination of forces, and consequently the origination of their laws. It is idle to say that they eternally existed in the mind and purpose of the Creator. That is true; but it must be conceded that their actual existence was not eternal; it began in time. Was this tremen-

dous change inconsistent with the unity and unchangeableness of God?

On the supposition of creation, there could have been no physical law or laws in accordance with which it was effected, since on that supposition nothing physical, no physical objects and no physical laws, were in previous existence. And it follows that in this great instance we have the proof that God acts above and without the very highest physical laws which it is possible to suppose. The supernatural agency of the divine will is demonstrated.

But this being granted, it will be urged that when physical forces and consequently physical laws, were brought into existence and started into operation, any subsequent change in them would imply the inconsistency of God with himself. That could only be shown by proving that when he created and projected them there was no eternal purpose to change them or to contravene their operation. That cannot be proved; and there are considerations which exhibit the groundlessness of the hypothesis. Although no intrinsic change in God is possible, there are extrinsic changes in his relations to finite objects. No actual relation could have subsisted between himself and created being until it was brought by his will into actual existence. A new relation, therefore, emerged, a relation involving in one of its terms—the created one—new forces and new laws. Now it follows from God's possession of the power to create, that he possesses the power to annihilate. The power which evokes something out of nothing can surely re-mand it to nothing. If, therefore, it should please the Almighty to exercise the power of annihilation, the finite object to which he was before actually related would, with everything it contains, be blotted out of being. Of course along with it would go the forces and laws which belonged to it and operated within its sphere. It makes no difference that we know of no instance of annihilation. For besides that our ignorance proves nothing but itself, it is sufficient to the purpose in hand to indicate the possibility of such an event. And as it is not possible for God to act inconsistently with himself, the supposition of the possibility of annihilation refutes the hypothesis that God cannot contravene the laws and change the constitution of nature established by him without inconsistency with himself.

As this argument goes to the root of the question, and the possibility of annihilation in which it is grounded may be disputed, the following proofs are briefly presented:

First, No power, so far as we are able to judge, can be greater than creative. Consequently the power required to annihilate cannot be greater than that to create. As, therefore, God creates, he is not incompetent to annihilate.

Secondly, If it was not contradictory to the divine Being that *once* nothing besides himself existed, it could not contradict that Being that *again* nothing besides himself should exist; in other words, that the universe should be annihilated. To say that, as God has brought the universe into being, he will not annihilate it is irrelevant; the question is in regard to the possibility of annihilation—not will God, but may he, annihilate?

Thirdly, All finite being absolutely depends for the continuance, as well as the beginning, of existence upon God, the only necessary and independent Being. This is the very reason of its existence. Were God, then, to will the withdrawal of his support, the cause of finite being would cease to operate, and consequently the effect—finite being itself—would cease to exist. To say that God cannot will to withdraw his support would be to speak unintelligently.

Fourthly, To suppose annihilation impossible is to limit the infinite power of God, which is itself impossible. If he cannot annihilate, he cannot do all things. There would be something which he cannot do. To say that he cannot contradict himself, and that to suppose annihilation is to suppose his contradiction of himself, is to make a mere assumption. For if he had given the express assurance that he will not annihilate—which cannot be proved—that would only show that he will not, and not that he cannot, annihilate.

Fifthly, Life, as a force operating in a particular organism, may be annihilated. Consequently, other forces connected with material things may be. It may be said that life, at what we call the death of the organized being, is simply transferred from special relation to that being; it may, for aught we know, be absorbed into some general fund of force. This cannot be proved; but if

the annihilation of life as related to organized beings is considered too doubtful to be employed in this argument, the spiritual life of the soul furnishes a case which is not doubtful. According to the testimony of the Scriptures, that life was destroyed by sin, and may be restored by the creative act of God in regeneration. Now it cannot be said that the spiritual life of the soul may be absorbed into a general fund of spiritual life, either as finite or as infinite. Not as finite, for that would destroy the supposition of the possession by a particular soul of an individual quality peculiarly its own; and further, as the whole race lost its spiritual life by sin, the existence of a general fund or reservoir of such life is unsupposable. Not as infinite, for that would concede the doctrine that the life of the creature is an emanation from God's life, and is one with it as a special form in which it is manifested. But if the spiritual force, which we justly denominate spiritual life, may be annihilated, much more may a force of lower importance related to merely material existences.

The conclusion is, that annihilation is possible. And then, if God may, consistently with himself, annihilate the universe of substantial being, he may annihilate all the forces which belong to it, which of course would involve the obliteration of the laws according to which they operate, since, if there were no operation, there could be no fixed mode of operation; and, therefore, reasoning from the greater to the less, it is possible for God to contravene a particular constitution of nature, and special laws in accordance with which some forces operate in connection with a single world or system.

If it be said that the annihilation of the substantial universe would not necessarily imply the annihilation of its forces, for the reason that they might be retracted into the infinite energy from which they sprung, the answer is twofold: *First*, this would be to take the pantheistic ground, and efface the distinction between the divine will and the forces operating upon matter. Those forces are grounded in the will of God and depend upon it for existence; they are controlled by it and express it, but they are not identical with it. If they are one and the same with it, the system of the dualism of spirit and matter is given up and that of monism ad-

mitted. It may be that, in attempting to *think* the annihilation of the forces of the universe, we could only conceive their re-absorption into the sum of existence, but what we cannot think we may believe. The limits of thought are not the limits of faith. We cannot think the infinite God, but we must believe in his existence. *Secondly*, if, according to the supposition, the forces of the universe would be retracted into the omnipotent energy of the divine Being, it is admitted that they would be out of connection with the universe; and as they could not operate upon nothing, the laws of their operations would be non-existent. The argument, therefore, holds good that the supposition of the annihilation of the universe involves the supposition of the contravention of all its laws. And if all may be contravened, some may.

(3.) With christian writers who urge the objection under consideration one clear, concrete instance of a violation of the known course of nature, and consequently a contravention of its known laws, which is established by the authority of the Bible, ought to be sufficient. Such an instance is the destruction of the world by fire. To the christian it makes no difference that the fact has not already occurred. God says the fact will occur. It may therefore enter into our reasoning with the force of a fact accomplished. It is certainly a part of that constitution of nature which we denominate uniform, that the earth is daily brought into relation to the beams of the sun which fructify it. But during the time that the world shall be burning and while it may continue, if God so please, in an incinerated condition, the law which has been mentioned will cease to operate. The sun may still shine, but it will not fructify the earth. This is clearly a case in which God, consistently with himself, will infringe the known laws of the present mundane system. For thousands of years, day by day, the sun will have vivified the earth. The induction of particular instances will be enormous. But on that day of the universal conflagration, the uniform operation of the law will be violently interrupted. One negative instance, according to the great maxim of Bacon, is sufficient to check a host of affirmatives. The negative instance here will be the fire which will stop the operation of a law that had persisted uninterruptedly, day after day, for millen-

niums. Will that infer divine inconsistency? If not, why should a lesser instance of the same sort? Other cases upon which a similar argument may be based might be adduced, such as the resurrection of the dead and the incarnation of the Son of God, but as they will be used in another part of the discussion, they will not now be emphasized.

(4.) It is difficult to see the force of this objection, in view of the consideration that the physical system is subordinate to the moral. It is the moral perfections of God which peculiarly constitute his glory. It may be safely assumed that for their illustration chiefly—we do not say exclusively—the whole material system was brought into being. What hinders, then, that for the attainment of great moral ends God should alter, or even destroy and re-arrange some particular natural system? Why may not this have been a part of his eternal plan, conceived as a whole? This line of argument is so obvious, that it is scarcely necessary to pursue it in detail.

(5.) It is admitted by all christian writers that the system of which we form a part is a disordered one. The revolutionary force of sin has entered it and marred its harmony. It is dominated by the law of sin and death, a law operating with undeviating uniformity and grounded upon an induction of particular facts as wide as the human race and reaching back to its origin. Now it is the office of that professed divine revelation, which appeals to miracles as its credentials, to announce a remedial scheme intended to recover the world from the operation of this law of sin and death. It involves as its very end a contradiction of that law. For if to make men holy and to restore them from the grave is to contradict sin and death, the gospel scheme most certainly professes to contradict the law of sin and death. Its very design is to antagonize and correct the disorder pervading both the moral and the physical system, and this it must accomplish, if at all, by destroying and removing it, just as the operation of the principle of health destroys disease in a disordered body and removes it from all connection with it. If, then, the remedial scheme proposed by a revelation claiming to be supernatural and divine is, in the general, contradictory to the great and admitted law of sin and death,

why should not the proofs of such a revelation be derived from events which contradict special laws operating upon the theatre of nature? If the general design be the destruction of all disorder, why may not certain particular laws which contribute to that disorder by their operation be contravened in order to prove that design? If the disorder as a whole may be contradicted, why not in part? But if the proofs cannot involve the contravention of specific laws, because that would make the Deity inconsistent with himself, there could be no remedial scheme which would contravene the universal law of sin and death. And so, farewell to the gospel! It is pronounced impossible, because the divine self-consistency and the harmony of a disordered and ruined world preclude it! The position that the miracle is contra-natural is charged even by some christian theologians as leading to infidelity. The answer is as easy as it is necessary, that the principle upon which the contra-natural character of the miracle is denied would make the delivery of men from the law of sin and death an impossibility, and consequently the scheme of redemption a figment. But that the reduction of disharmony to harmony, and of disorder to order, that the substitution of holiness for sin, of life for death and of bliss for woe, by violating the laws of an anomalous and abnormal system, is unworthy of God, it passes one's comprehension to see.

This argument would be enhanced upon the supposition of the pessimist, that this world is not only disordered, but as bad as it can be. For, if it be absolute evil, its perfect contradictory would be absolute good. The more of contradiction to it the better: the more of contradiction to it, the nearer the approach to heaven and the farther the recession from hell. Who would oppose a contradiction to the laws operating in such a system? If this world be the vestibule of hell, by all means let us have contradictions to its laws, whether by the proofs, or the constituent elements, of a scheme which proposes to redeem it from reigning evil and constitute it the porch of heaven.

2. It is objected to the contra-natural and contra-legal character of miracles, that they are wrought in conformity to higher laws than those with which we are acquainted.

(1.) This objection is irrelevant, and therefore is destitute of force. All that is affirmed in the definition of a miracle here given is that it contravenes some *known* law or laws of that course or constitution of nature by which we are environed and conditioned and with which we are familiar. To object that there is a course or constitution of nature higher than this, embracing unknown laws in accordance with which what are called miracles may be wrought, is to travel beyond the bounds of the question under consideration and to introduce a new and foreign issue. It is of course admitted that there must be, from the nature of the case, and is in fact, a general plan upon which all the works of creation and providence, having been eternally purposed by the supreme Ruler of the universe, are in time executed by him. Bishop Butler, in his powerful argument to show that there is no presumption from analogy against miracles, says, that "a miracle, in its very notion, is relative to a course of nature; and implies somewhat different from it, considered as being so." He further says, that "it might be part of the original plan of things, that there should be miraculous interpositions."¹ If the fact of miracles be allowed, every theist must deepen this cautious language of Butler into must be. They are not improvised to meet emergencies in the divine government. But provided for eternally as they were in God's great scheme, the provision is precisely this, that the course of a particular system should be extraordinarily transcended and contravened for high religious ends. What is there impossible in this supposition? It cannot be impossible, unless it involve the Deity in inconsistency with himself, and that has already been disproved.

(2.) Of a course or constitution of nature different from and higher than that to which we are related, we can, in the exercise of mere reason unassisted by a supernatural revelation, know nothing, at least with certainty, and consequently it could not possibly be a sphere in which *evidence* is presented to us. The question about which we are engaged is one of evidence. How can a revelation claiming to be divine be proved? The proofs furnished ought to be of the most convincing character. They must, there-

¹ *Anal.*, Pt. II., Chap. 2.

fore, be derived from that course or constitution of things with which we are familiarly acquainted, and about which we are able to judge with confidence. To invoke the operation of higher laws than those which are known to us is to transfer the proofs into a region in which conjecture is substituted for evidence. To bring in the consideration of higher laws is to envelope the whole question in clouds and darkness. The appeal to evidence becomes impossible.

But these higher laws, What are they? Let them be named and described. If they be unknown, what can be predicated of them? They are introduced without description merely to serve a purpose. We indicate the laws of which we speak—we name them, we describe them, we know what they are and how they operate. Of unknown elements we have nothing to say, and we are entitled to ask that others should maintain like silence in regard to them. If by higher laws it be meant to designate ethical ends, as Trench does, there is a confusion of terms. We are speaking of laws, not ends; and no one dreams of denying that ethical ends are contemplated in the working of miracles. That constitutes an element of the definition which we furnish. Surely it is an ethical end which is secured when a revelation professing to be divine is attested. If by ethical ends are meant the moral results in particular cases of miracle-working, as, for instance, the healing of diseases by Christ, it is granted that they entered, to a greater or less extent, into those miracles, but it cannot be proved that they were the only, or even the chief, ends contemplated in their production. When, however, it is conceded that miracles are wrought for ethical purposes, what has been established against the position that they contravene the known course of nature and contradict some of its known laws? Nothing whatsoever.

3. It is by some objected, that miracles are not contraventions of the known course of nature, not violations of its laws, because they are merely the results of the introduction into that course of new antecedents. The introduction of new antecedents being allowed, new natural consequents follow in strict accordance with the known laws of nature. Dr. Thomas Brown, of Edinburgh, in the Notes appended to his treatise on the "Relation of Cause and

Effect," elaborately maintains this view.¹ He says that "the will of the Deity, whether displayed in those obvious variations of events, which are termed miracles, or inferred from those supposed secret and invisible changes which are ascribed to his providence, is itself, in all such cases, to be regarded by the affirmer of it as a new physical antecedent, from which, if it really form a part of the series of events, a difference of result may naturally be expected, on the same principle as that on which we expect a change of product from any other new combination of physical circumstances." Or, to put the case more briefly, as Dr. J. R. Beard does in his "Voices of the Church," in reply to Strauss, quoted by Dr. Wardlaw: "Simply a new antecedent comes into action, and a new consequent necessarily ensues."

(1.) This begs the question. It is assumed that the immediate efficiency of the Deity is a new antecedent. But the very question is whether God does immediately act? Is the event itself of such a character as to necessitate the conclusion that it takes place in consequence of his immediate efficiency? If so, the inference is legitimate that he attests the commission or revelation in connection with which it is produced. This hypothesis assumes the point in dispute, and therefore logically breaks down.

(2.) According to the meaning of the terms *new antecedent*, it must be supposed to be a force or influence which is foreign to the known course of nature. It is, *e concessio*, new. The uniform operation of the known laws of nature would not lead us to expect its operation. It would then be unwarrantable to say that it was provided for in the known scheme of nature. It therefore unexpectedly traverses the known course of nature; that is, it is contra-natural. Certainly, the immediate exercise of divine efficiency without the employment of second causes, would be a new antecedent, but it would be one for which the known system of nature makes no provision. It would be alien to that system and could only enter it by invading it. The law by which its appointment was excluded would be contradicted.

The theory for which Dr. Brown contends is that the unifor-

¹ The same view, substantially, is maintained by Dr. Samuel Harris, in his recent work, *The Self-Revelation of God*, chap. 15., on Miracles.

mity of nature is but the result of a series of *invariable* antecedents and sequents. But a new, wholly unexpected antecedent could not be supposed to fall in with this law of "invariable antecedence and sequence." It would be an extraordinary and exceptional variation from such a uniform course. And how the course of nature can be invariable and variable one fails to see.

To this it may be answered, that the uniform series of antecedents and consequents is not inconsistent with the occasional introduction of new natural causes, or, what is the same thing in Dr. Brown's nomenclature, new "physical antecedents." Now, either these are second causes or they are not. If they are, Dr. Brown's conception of the miracle as involving the immediate efficiency of God—that is, his efficiency acting not mediately through second causes, but apart from them—is contradicted. If they are not second causes, then, in the first place, it may be demanded how we are to know that they are not. New antecedents, in the form of second causes, known only to certain persons of unusual scientific knowledge, and employed by them to condition new and surprising results, astonish and confound the generality of men who are ignorant of them. How could such events indicate the immediate efficiency of God, when a man of scientific skill or a devil might, for aught is known, be their producer? Unless the very nature of the event, as one manifestly competent only to divine power, proves the immediate intervention of that power, such intervention cannot with certainty be presumed. Now the only sort of event, we make bold to say, which can be demonstrated to be a product of God's immediate efficiency alone is one which contravenes some known law of nature. In the second place, if these new antecedents are not second causes, they would lie outside of the domain of scientific observation, outside of that system of "invariable antecedence and sequence" in which it is possible to employ induction and generalization in order to group the facts of nature into laws. The properties of finite things and beings may be observed and their effects, or, if one pleases, sequents may be noted and classified. But what instrument of observation is nice enough to detect the occult exertions of God's immediate efficiency, and reduce them to the category of laws? Is it not manifest that such

new antecedents, contradistinguished as they are to second causes which are subject to observation, cannot be harnessed into a system of natural law? In the third place, one cannot help wondering that the astute mind of Dr. Brown did not perceive that a two-fold absurdity lurks in his position. His hypothesis is that the will of God alone is efficient, and that what are called second causes and effects are merely antecedents and sequents devoid of all productive connection with each other. It follows necessarily that the immediate efficiency of God can never be occasional, and therefore no miracle considered simply as an exceptional event would be possible; and it follows also that as every sequent may in turn become an antecedent of a new sequent, one instance of divine efficiency produces another instance of divine efficiency; that is, the divine efficiency produces itself. In the fourth place, the assumption that in the miracle the immediate efficiency of God is a new antecedent resulting in a new consequent in accordance with some known law of nature, is refuted by a glance at the miracles of Scripture and at the illustrations employed by these writers to support their view. One used by Dr. Brown will suffice, and it is selected because it is plausible and because it precisely expresses the view for which he contends. (*Cause and Effect*, Note E.):

“That a quantity of gunpowder, apparently as inert as the dust on which we tread, should suddenly turn into a force of the most destructive kind, all the previous circumstances continuing exactly the same, would be indeed contrary to the course of nature, but it would not be contrary to it, if the change were preceded by the application of a spark. It would not be more so, if the antecedent were any other existing power of equal efficacy; and the physical influence which we ascribe to a single spark, it would surely not be too much to claim for that Being to whom we have been led by the most convincing evidence to refer the very existence of the explosive mass itself, and of all the surrounding bodies on which it operates,” etc. “Events of this kind, therefore, if truly taking place, would be only the operation of one of the acknowledged powers of nature, producing indeed what no other power might be capable of producing, but what would deserve as much to be considered as the natural consequence of the power from which it flows, as any other phenomenon to be regarded as the natural consequence of its particular antecedent. . . . Every law of nature continues as it was, for every antecedent has its ordinary effect.”

All that the advocates of the contra-natural character of the miracle desire is here conceded. For this supposed miracle of Dr.

Brown let us substitute the real miracle at Cana. A "quantity" of water was suddenly turned into a quantity of wine, without the operation of any known force of nature, or what is termed a second cause. The law here infringed was that, according to the known course of nature, water is not convertible into wine without the operation of some natural force or second cause. But the conversion did take place without the intervention of such a force or cause. That law was consequently violated. The circumstances which condition the production of an effect, or, as Dr. Brown would have it, the occurrence of a sequent, are, from the nature of the case, natural circumstances; that is, those which are involved in the system of the world known to us. If they are supposed to be supernatural circumstances, they are ruled out of the question; they would not belong, *ex hypothesi*, to the order of nature. If introduced, they would traverse that order. The ground, therefore, is legitimately taken that the water was changed into wine, "all the previous circumstances" belonging to the known order of nature having continued exactly the same. The miracle was therefore "contrary to the course of nature." But if it be a law of nature that water cannot be instantly converted into wine by the operation of any known natural cause—and who will deny?—it becomes still more evident that the actual conversion was a contravention of a known law.

But it will be said that this is not the whole case. Dr. Brown contends that all the previous circumstances do not remain the same. A new circumstance is introduced. What? The power of God in the miracle acts immediately, apart from the envelope, so to speak, of ordinary antecedents, and acts, as a natural force, in accordance with the laws of nature. Now, one is entitled to ask, What laws? In the instance of the miracle at Cana, with what law of nature did the divine efficiency accord? That under certain circumstances water may be changed into wine? Dr. Brown might safely have been challenged, and the advocates of this view may now be safely challenged, to indicate the law. Upon what induction of particulars has such a generalization ever been effected? To answer: the law that "every antecedent has its ordinary effect," is to play off upon words. Is it an "ordinary" ef-

fect that any antecedent is followed by the consequent of the conversion of water into wine? One might here pause to expose Dr. Brown's egregious confusion of terms. He continually talks, like other men, of natural powers producing effects, and of effects produced by their antecedents. And yet it is the very purpose of his philosophy to show that there is no productive relation between what are called causes and effects—they are mere antecedents and sequents. To say, then, that it is a law of nature that "every antecedent has its ordinary effect" is, in his case, either to speak absurdly, or to contradict himself. Although, however, Dr. Brown's theory of causation is one which contradicts the laws of human belief and human usage—was it a miracle of paradox?—we do not now intend to assail it. But there is one of his positions touching the miracle that must be emphasized under another point.

(3.) The ground is maintained by the Edinburgh philosopher and by some recent writers of note, that in the miracle the divine power comes immediately into play as one of the powers of nature. We have heard Dr. Brown expressly terming it "one of the acknowledged powers of nature." Were this granted, it would of course fall in with the course of nature and constitute one of its forces. Consequently a miracle wrought by it could not be contrary to the course of nature.

First, It is easy to convict this individual writer of palpable inconsistency. His doctrine is clear. What is called the relation of cause and effect is a relation of mere antecedence and sequence. In this system, it is the power of God alone which produces effects. That power operates universally in nature. Antecedents are barren of results—they are simply the signs of the divine efficiency. It is therefore the *only* real power, the *only* power which is efficacious in producing effects. How then, it is asked, can it be *one* of the powers of nature? If it be one of them, there are other powers of nature different from it. What are they? Are they antecedents which have no power? The sole power of nature, and yet one of a class of powers with which it is coördinated, and powers the very existence of which is denied! If it had been allowed that natural antecedents possess a derived, dependent, limited power, one could recognize a distinction between the power of

God acting mediately through that power and acting immediately and apart from it. But as no such power is conceded to these antecedents, it comes to this: the power of God immediately causes every effect, but there are some effects which are exceptional and extraordinary because the power of God immediately causes them. Such are Dr. Brown's miracles!

Secondly, Let us throw out of account Dr. Brown's peculiar theory of causation, and direct our attention to that part of his doctrine which is common between him and certain other writers who oppose the contra-natural character of the miracle, namely, the position that the power of God, as immediately exercised, is one of the forces of nature. The view is maintained by several recent writers that there are no exceptions to the uniform, continuous operation of law. The unbroken continuity of law is asserted. So far do these authors go as to affirm that redemption itself is not what it has commonly been regarded—"the Great Exception" to the undeviating reign of law. The Duke of Argyll, in his *Reign of Law*, says:¹ "Assuredly, whatever may be the difficulties of christianity, *this* is not one of them—that it calls on us to believe in any exception to the universal prevalence and power of law." Professor Drummond, in his *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*, steps in the tracks of the Duke, when he says, "Science can hear nothing of a Great Exception"; and that he himself can hear nothing of it is sufficiently evinced in these words: "If there is any truth in the unity of nature, in that supreme principle of continuity which is growing in splendor with every discovery of science, the conclusion is foregone. If there is any foundation for theology, if the phenomena of the spiritual world are real, in the nature of things they ought to come into the sphere of law. Such is at once the demand of science upon religion, and the prophecy that it can and shall be fulfilled."²

Without stopping now to expose the radical subversion of the gospel contained in the denial that redemption originated in the mere mercy of God apart from the demands of law, and the glaring absurdity that law suggested the deliverance of transgressors out of the grasp of law, we pass on to examine the sweeping affir-

¹ P. 49.

² Pp. 18, 20.

mation that there is no exception to law, inasmuch as it would destroy the contra-natural character of miracles, which it is the purpose of these remarks to establish. Both of the authors alluded to maintain the "identity" of the laws operating in the natural and the spiritual worlds; and in this respect again Professor Drummond ploughs with the Duke of Argyll's heifer.¹ To accomplish this, the old distinction, recognized by the Church of God in all ages, between the natural and the supernatural is obliterated. All is natural. Grace is nature. In the miracle the power of God is but one of the powers of nature, acting extraordinarily, but still acting in conformity with natural law.

Now, these authors, as men of science, will admit that even material substances, not to speak of mental, possess peculiar properties by virtue of which they act, in their appropriate relations, as forces. They concede the force of gravity, of electricity, of chemical affinity, and the like. But as theists and christians they hold that these forces are specific manifestations of a generic power resident in the will of Almighty God. Even Mr. Spencer, whom Professor Drummond sometimes cites with approval, maintains that all the special forces of nature may be correlated upon a great, central force—"an infinite and eternal energy." It follows that all the canons of classification would be violated by reducing the generic, all-pervading power of God, sustaining, directing and controlling the subordinate forces of creatures, to coördination with them as a specific force. Can the divine power be coördinated with electricity, magnetism, chemical affinity, heat, gravity, and the like? Does it not involve a logical solecism to speak of it as one of these powers or forces? It is as if one should coördinate the genus animal with the species included under it, as one of them, and enumerate the species as animal, lion, horse, etc.

This may be regarded as an unjust statement of the view under examination. Let us, then, test it by an application to a concrete case. Professor Drummond, in his chapter on Biogenesis, advocates the law formulated in Harvey's great maxim, *omne vivum ex ovo* or *ex vivo*—life cannot be generated from death; it must spring from life. This law, he contends, rules in the spiritual and

¹ *Reign of Law*, pp. 50, 51.

the natural world. He rejects spontaneous generation in both spheres. Now the sinner is spiritually dead. He cannot, therefore, evolve his own spiritual life. He may, however, receive spiritual life by contact with the life that is in Christ. Biogenesis holds good everywhere. It is a law with which the power of God in regeneration conforms. Now, we beg to know how the generalization expressed in Harvey's maxim was formed. The answer must be, Upon an induction of particulars in the domain of the physical. Had the Professor been content to signalize the analogy between this law in the physical sphere with a law in the spiritual, the case would be different from what it is. But this he denies as being utterly inadequate, because utterly unsatisfactory to science. He has made a new discovery, which will hush the conflict between orthodox believers and scientific men. He explicitly contends that the law enounced in the aphorism under consideration is the very law which prevails in the spiritual world. "There are not," he observes, "two laws of Biogenesis, one for the natural, the other for the spiritual; one law is for both. Wherever there is life—life of any kind—this same law holds. The analogy, therefore, is only among the phenomena; between laws there is no analogy—there is continuity."¹ The natural and the supernatural sphere being one and the same, the law which operates in the former is by continuity projected into the latter, or rather it continues to operate in the same sphere. If, then, it begins natural it must persist as natural. It is natural law which operates in what is usually called the spiritual world. When, therefore, the life-giving power of Christ quickens the spiritually dead sinner, it is exerted in obedience to the natural law of Biogenesis. It becomes one of the life-communicating powers of nature conforming to natural law. But as the life-giving power of Christ is divine, the divine power is coördinated, as a specific force, with the other specific forces of nature. The concrete case has justified the abstract affirmation, that this writer commits the blunder of reducing the universal power of God to the category of a particular force, and coördinating it with the specific forces of nature. As there is an electric, so there is a Christic, force.

¹ *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*, p. 76.

If it be excepted, that in one case a life-communicating force operates upon a material subject, in the other upon a spiritual, we will take the resurrection of the dead body. That is material. The life-giving power of Christ must be held by Professor Drummond to operate in this case in conformity with natural law. He would be obliged to rank the life-imparting power of God which raises the dead body to life as one of the forces of nature, physically considered. And, as law supposes a series of particular facts, otherwise it could not be characterized by continuity, one cannot forbear asking Professor Drummond upon what series of particular facts he would base the law of the resurrection of the dead. Supposing that he could reduce the fact of resurrection under a general law of Biogenesis, would he deny that the power which produces that fact contravenes the particular law of death? If he would not, he concedes the position that a miracle contravenes some known law of that system of nature with which we are acquainted. The same thing holds in regard to the miracle of regeneration—it contradicts the law of spiritual death.

Professor Drummond may further be asked, if there is a Christic force operating in nature to give life to the spiritually dead, how it comes to pass that it is not characterized by uniformity. Why are some men made spiritually alive by it, and others not? By what law is the operation of this natural force checked, so as to operate unequally upon the spiritually dead? Would he reply, The law of Election? If he did, as a Calvinist he must, would he reduce the free, sovereign will of God, the source of election, under the reign of law? To say, Yes, for God is a law to himself, would be to trifle with the subject, since the question is in regard to laws which terminate upon the objects of finite nature.

Finally, as the Professor will admit that we are dependent upon revelation for the knowledge of God's willingness to regenerate sinners, it may be asked, Is that revelation the product of natural law? If the answer be, It is the product of the law of benevolence, what becomes of the law of justice, which demanded the destruction of transgressors? It is obvious that it was the result of a free and sovereign determination of the divine will, and

the attempt to subject that to the operation of law could scarcely be screened from the imputation of profanity. But whatever view may be taken of the origin of revelation, it cannot with truth be denied that it contravenes the universal law of human ignorance with reference to spiritual things. And so we make our bow, on retiring, to Dr. Brown, the Duke of Argyll, and Professor Drummond.

4. It is further objected, that a miracle is not contra-natural, because one law is extraordinarily introduced as counteracting another law, and nothing is more common in nature than such a fact.

(1.) Here *extraordinarily introduced* may mean either extra-naturally introduced or not. If the former, the question is given up. For it would be conceded that no provision is made for such an introduction of law into the known system of nature, in accordance with which intelligent foresight may exist and intelligent action adopted. It would be the intervention of one of those supposed "higher laws" which, as has already been shown, must be ruled out of the discussion. If the latter, the law would only be one exceptionally operating among the known laws of nature, and it is admitted in these remarks that one known law frequently counteracts another known law. No miracle, in such instances, exists. But this leads us to consider the gist of the objection, and it will be evinced to consist in a mistake of the *status questionis*.

(2.) The question is not, whether in the miracle a known law of nature is counteracted, but it is, whether the counteraction of a known law is accomplished in the absence of any natural cause. In the former case, the course of nature may be complied with; in the latter it is contravened. Miracles may be distinguished into two classes: those which could not be effected by any natural or even by any finite cause, and those which might be effected by such a cause and are not. The changing of water into wine in an instant, the supply of the hunger of thousands with a few loaves of bread and a few fishes, and the raising of the dead, are instances of the first class. As they involve the exercise of creative power, they could not be effected by any natural cause. They obviously infer the immediate efficiency of Almighty God. The swimming of the iron axe in the Jordan is a specimen of the second class.

It might have been effected by a natural cause; the force of gravity might have been counteracted by muscular or mechanical force; but it was not so effected. The absence of any natural, or second, cause stamped the event miraculous. In such cases, we are obliged to admit that the effects *might* be produced by præter-human agency, say by that of the devil, notwithstanding the fact that no natural cause is apparent. But when the effect is produced in designed connection with the teaching of a person claiming to be a commissioned messenger from God, teaching intended and adapted to promote holiness, we are warranted on ethical grounds to exclude the agency of evil spirits. Physically, the effect might possibly be produced by such agency, morally it could not.

Leaving out of view now the first class of miracles, which, palpably involving creative power, are, as contraventions of a course of nature excluding the ordinary exercise of that power, patent seals of heaven's High Chancery, let us contemplate the second class. Take the instance of the axe floating in the Jordan. The natural law which held it at the bottom was that of gravitation. Now the swimming of the axe on the surface of the stream was not simply the result of the counteraction of that law. Had any natural means been used to pull or lift the axe to the surface, the counteraction of gravitation would have been in accordance with the known course of nature; there would have been no miracle. But the iron rose to the surface without the employment of any such natural means. The law which was contradicted was that iron, or any other substance of greater specific gravity than water, will not rise to its surface unless some natural force counteract the force of gravitation. That law, established upon an induction of innumerable particular instances, was contradicted, for the iron did rise to the surface of the water, and float upon it, without the intervention of any natural force counteracting that of gravitation. The known course of nature was contravened. It may be added that the objection is also founded upon too narrow a basis. It takes no account of general laws which regulate the relations to each other of special laws.

5. There is a conceivable difficulty which, to our mind, is more

formidable in the way of the definition of a miracle that has here been given than those which have been examined. It is this: Creation is the highest exercise of divine power of which we have any notion. The miracle, therefore, as an instance of divine efficiency, cannot rise higher than creative power. Without the assertion of its truth, let it be supposed that the doctrine of some scientific thinkers may be true, that successive orders of beings are brought into existence, not by an unbroken process of evolution through the transmutation of species, but by periodically recurring acts of creative power originating new species. Were that a law of nature, the successive exertions of creative power would be natural. They would form a part of the course of nature. As, then, the miracle can be no more than an exercise of creative power, it could not be regarded as a contravention of the course of nature. To this we answer:

Creation establishes an order or constitution of things which we call natural. It is fixed and uniform, governed by laws which operate in a regular manner. Upon the hypothesis before us, the successive acts of creative power, by which new species of beings may be produced, are put forth in the line of this fixed system of operation. They fall in with it, and carry it on to that end which the whole constitution of nature was designed to secure. But if we suppose an exercise of creative power which is manifestly exceptional to the order in which that kind of power ordinarily acts, and which, moreover, contradicts that order and interrupts it, we would have an instance, not of a natural, but of a contra-natural effect. Certain species of animals, for example, are created, and in the course of nature those species decay and perish, and others are produced and take their place. Now, it is admitted that the creation of the new species would be natural. But if a certain species which became extinct were by creative power to be reproduced, that would be contra-natural. And this will be seen more clearly, if we suppose also that the old species, once dead and then new-created, is not intended to live on and propagate, but only to exist for a short time in one or a very few non-productive individuals. That would be a procedure evidently contradictory to what we know as the course of nature.

So, for God to create a new species of human beings might be in accordance with natural law. But if a single man is raised from the dead, who is not designed to originate a new species, that would be entirely contra-natural. There are no analogies even, which would lead us, antecedently to experience, to expect such an event. The resurrection of Lazarus and of Jesus were events of that sort. They cannot by any ingenuity be referred to the operation of any known law; on the contrary, they sharply cross the line of known law. They were wholly exceptional instances of creative power, not exercised for the purpose of starting a new species. They, with other instances of resurrection, stand alone, conspicuous examples of an extraordinary and supernatural intervention of Almighty God. There was no Lazarite species which sprang from the raised Lazarus, and there were no descendants of Jesus according to the flesh. The only adequate reason which can be assigned for the exercise of creative power in the resurrection of Lazarus is that it was intended to be a credential of the commission of Jesus and of a supernatural revelation.

It has not been our purpose to discuss the possibility, the credibility and the fact of miracles. But taking them for granted, we proceed very briefly to show the bearing of the miracle, as contra-natural, upon various theories.

1. **Atheism:** The miracle proves the existence of God. If the order of nature is interrupted and contravened, such an effect could only be attributed to an extra-mundane Being of power sufficient to accomplish it. For no system can be supposed to make provision for its own infraction; and if notwithstanding this the infraction occurs, it must be ascribed to an Agent outside of the system powerful enough to revolutionize and reverse it if he pleases.

2. **Pantheism, Atheistic Evolution and Materialism:** These theories stand upon the same foot in one important respect. They hold that the processes of nature are enforced by a law of blind, immanent necessity, in one case evolving the world from an impersonal divine substance, in the other two, from primordial elements of matter. To say that a contra-natural event has occurred is to say that one sort of necessity has been contradicted by another sort of necessity, which is absurd. For a system embracing two

such necessary elements would be self-contradictory and 'suicidal—self-contradictory, because it would necessarily evolve contradictory elements—suicidal, because it would necessarily provide for its own infraction, and for aught that appears to the contrary, its own destruction.

3. The professed Theistic Evolutionist must find the miracle a stumbling-stone to his theory. For he holds that God evolves the world by an unbroken process of mediate creation. No mediate creation consequently could be miraculous. He appeals to the miracle of creation from nothing in the first instance. But creation from nothing cannot be a miracle, for two reasons: *First*, such creation begins the order of nature. On the supposition, therefore, there was no nature in relation to which an event could be determined to be miraculous, or even extraordinary. *Secondly*, science knows of no other intelligences than human beings, and as they were not in existence before creation *ex nihilo*, miraculous evidence was an impossibility. He cannot, therefore, admit the existence of the miracle. But if it has occurred, it contradicts his theory.

4. The professed Christian Evolutionist must also find the miracle difficult of adjustment to his theory. The revealed fact, for example, of the general resurrection of the dead absolutely contradicts it, for it will involve the revival of an extinct species from their dust, nor will it be the transmutation of one species into a new and different one, but the persistence of the very same species. He may say that while his science denies, the Scriptures affirm, and that he holds to both, to the former on rational grounds, to the latter by faith. But they are mutually contradictory, and one must be true, the other false. Will he hold to both contradictories and so make his science contradict his religion? Perhaps he will use the plea of the Bishop of Cologne, who, on being rebuked for swearing, said that he swore not as a bishop but as a man; or that of Pomponatius, who as a philosopher denied the immortality of the soul, but professed to believe it as a christian; which occasioned the witty remark of Bocalini that "he must be acquitted of heresy as a man and a christian, but burnt for it as a philosopher."

5. Agnosticism: The contra-natural character of the miracle

proves the interposition in nature of a personal will, and as it accompanies a teaching which ascribes that will to a being characterized by certain attributes, it proves the existence of a God who may be known and worshipped, loved and obeyed.

We have thus endeavored to establish the contra-natural character of miracles against the most prominent objections which have been urged in opposition to it. In another discussion the attempt will be made to show that all the principal evidences of divine revelation are reducible to unity upon the miracle as contra-natural.

JOHN L. GIRARDEAU.

II. THE UNCHANGEABLE WORD.

To a literary man there is something remarkable in the improvements made in the science and literature of the present day. There is a restless activity of mind that urges men forward in the pursuit of knowledge. Old ideas that were considered fixed and definite are now becoming obsolete. Old principles that were esteemed fixed and eternal are now seen to be fallacious. Old conceptions that once startled the world by their grandeur are now looked upon as ridiculous and discarded with contempt. Indeed, there is a constant fluctuation, a constant enlargement, a constant development in almost all branches of human knowledge. Men are not satisfied with present attainments, but are stirring up every energy of thought in order that they may make subservient to their use all the elements of nature.

It is the opinion of some wise men that this world will last until some use is found for everything that God has created in it; that mind will progress in its mastery over material until all natural objects are brought under control and made conducive to the welfare of its master; that discoveries in the realm of true science will continue to be made until everything in air, earth and sea has been made to subserve the comfort and happiness of man. Of course no finite mind can say whether this is true or the empty speculation of those who have been roused to a lofty height of enthusiasm by recent discoveries and inventions. We know that most startling changes have been made in the past few years. Old, settled systems have been revolutionized. The whole order of things has been changed. Mind has been progressing. Some of the wisest maxims of ancient sages are now seen to be absurd, and the profound wisdom of other days is yielding the palm to the superior intelligence of the present.

But while these things are true as to human knowledge, let us ever bear in mind that there can be no changes in that book which God wrote for the light and the life of the world. The great truths that were originally written in the Word of God are un-

alterably the same. No lapse of time can make them obsolete, no hypothesis nor actual discoveries of human science and philosophy can change their true meaning or design. They are fixed, definite, unalterable, eternal. "Forever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven."

These words of the Psalmist do not mean to assert that no improvements can be made in the knowledge and understanding of Scripture truth; they do not mean to assert that all the facts and dogmas of the Bible are so clearly understood that there is no room for honest argument and controversy among able and conscientious scholars; nor do they mean to deny that there are some things in the Bible which the highest human minds are unable to grasp and to comprehend.

This is readily granted, and stands as one of the grandest arguments to prove the divine origin of the Bible. There are truths, and *ex necessitate* there must be truths, in a revelation from an omniscient God, that are beyond the utmost scope and reach of finite human reason. There are some things written by Paul which Peter, another apostle, declared to be hard to understand. There are some statements which, at first sight, seem to be positive contradictions of others. There are many things, clearly revealed to ransomed sinners of the human race, which the angels desire to look into. And to the ransomed sons of Adam it will ever be a subject of adoring wonder, that the Lord Jesus "took not on him the nature of angels, but took on him the seed of Abraham." It may be that there are many such mysteries that will baffle our ransomed powers, even when they are no longer clogged with sense and sin, but shall "see as we are seen, and know as we are known."

But for all this, the Psalmist has taught us to say, "Forever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven." The canon of inspiration is closed forever. The Bible, as originally written, was never to be altered or amended. It was perfect, complete, finished and forever settled, as far as God designed it for the use of man. Transcribers and publishers may have marred its perfection, in the manuscripts and revisions that have brought it down to us through the ages; but when it came from the hand of God, it was as per-

fect as Adam was when God made him from the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and he became a living soul.

That this must be so, we argue, (*u*), from the fact that the same God inspired the whole of it, from Genesis to Revelation. It is true that in the Bible we have certain peculiarities of style that belong to the different authors of the various books. Moses does not write like Daniel, nor does Isaiah write like David. Matthew does not write in the same style as Luke, nor does Paul write in the same style as Peter, James or John. The subjects on which they wrote were not always the same, and their own personal peculiarities are apparent in all their writings. Carlyle and Macaulay are not more marked and conspicuous in their difference of style than are some of the inspired men who were called of God to write out these lively oracles that have come down to us from the olden times.

The fact is, this wonderful book is a most unique embodiment of what is known as "unity in diversity." There is all manner of variety about it. It is in some parts doctrinal, in others practical; in some parts historical, in others prophetic; in some parts didactic, in others pathetic; in some parts it is written in the simplest and purest prose, and in others in the most elevated and oriental poetry.

But while all this is true, so that, as a mere book, it might seem like a combination of Cæsar and Horace, or Thucydides and Homer, in the Bible, in all its pages, "holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost;" they were each and all inspired by "that self-same Spirit who divideth to every man severally as he will." "All scripture is given by inspiration of God," and hence, every word, as it was originally written, was an expression of the mind of God, and was used by him to express just such thoughts as he intended to convey. Every writer was, at the time, completely under the control of God, just as much so as he could have been had God taken hold of his hand, and guided him in the writing of every sentence, and in the choice of every word in the book.

This is the true idea of plenary verbal inspiration, that the

same Being indited every sentence and enunciated every sentiment that is there recorded. It was the same divine mind that was writing through the human hand of each of these inspired writers, from Moses, the man of God, to John, the exile on the Isle of Patmos. It was the same knowledge, the same perfect understanding, the same divine wisdom, from which emanated through these amanuenses every word that gilds and glorifies the sacred pages of this paragon of all the books that ever have been written.

But if this be so, and the Bible is really the production of the same Holy Being, then the book must be as complete and perfect as its divine author. He may seem to say one thing in one place, and a different thing in another, but such cannot be the case. There is, there must be, some rational way in which these apparent contradictions can be reconciled. "The axe did swim," whether we ever saw an axe swim or not. The water was turned to wine, whether we ever saw such a mode of making wine or not. The people did go over dry-shod, whether we ever saw such a wonderful work or not. We are "justified by faith," and we are "justified by works," and there is a method by which all these statements of God himself can commend themselves to human reason, and there will be no mistakes to be charged to Moses, or to any other man who wrote what God himself had told him to write. It was God, the same God, who wrote it all, and it must be true.

(*b.*) This will be more apparent when we think of God's attributes, those characteristics which set him forth as a perfect being.

Human authors have sometimes changed their views and thus been constrained to contradict what they had written in all honesty at some former time. They have learned to reason or to modify their conceptions of truth by subsequent investigations. There is, perhaps, scarcely an author of prominence who has not seen cause to retract or to modify opinions that he has been in the habit of asserting as if proved beyond all contradiction. There is many an author, too, that is so carried away by the impulse of the moment or the enthusiasm awakened by his subject, that he uses unguarded expressions or advances ideas that he would in cooler moments have to modify or to withdraw and repudiate.

But of course no such things as these can be thought of touch-

ing those scriptures which God has written. God is never moved by a mere impulse nor actuated by what we know as sudden and excessive emotion. We cannot conceive of him as forgetting what he once said or as adding one iota to his present and perpetual knowledge. He is perfect, and therefore must be absolutely beyond all changes of mind. There is a symmetry, a completeness, a perfection in the mind of God which is actually inconceivable to the wisest of all mere men.

Now, if God has chosen to give us a revelation of himself, of his character, and of his will, and of his person, and of his works, must we not conclude *a priori* that such a revelation would be, must be, complete and perfect? It is not like creation; for while that was "very good" as it came from the great architect, God knew that it was liable to be cursed on account of Adam's sin. He knew that it would become a scene of carnage, and be scarred all over with the graves that sin would dig upon its surface through successive ages. He knew that it would have to be washed with a deluge and be purified with fire on account of the blighting, withering, blasting curse that sin would spread all over its surface.

But not so with "the word of God." That was an expression of God's will, a reflection of God's character, and was intended to be an accurate statement of all those great principles that underlie his moral and spiritual kingdom. It must of course then partake of the general character of God himself. It could not be imperfect, unfinished, liable to improvement or detraction. It must be a perfect revelation, or no revelation at all. If it claims to be written or dictated by the mind of God it must show the attributes of that infinite and perfect mind that dictated it. It certainly is more impossible for God to write what is false or fallible than it would be for the wisest and the most accurate writer that ever lived on earth. God cannot lie; God cannot change; God cannot make a mistake. And hence, when we are once sure of the fact that we have what God wrote, no matter how long ago, we can rest assured that we have that which "liveth and abideth forever."

(c.) We argue the unchangeableness of the Scriptures from the great object for which they were written. What, then, was the

grand purpose of revelation? The ultimate aim and object was to teach all nations and all ages the one great method of God's mercy to man. We must remember that there never was, and we are forced to believe that there never will be, but one scheme of redemption. It has been revealed, under different forms and phases, to suit the peculiar tastes and comprehension of different generations of men.

But the same gospel was preached to Adam that is preached at the present day. The same great plan of redemption was laid before the minds of patriarchs, prophets, evangelists and apostles. It was not a new revelation to each succeeding age, but the gradual unfolding of the same spiritual plan of reconciliation with God, adapted to the different degrees of light and knowledge. God was just gradually unfolding his scheme of mercy to the human race; but the one great, radical, fundamental truth is taught in all: "This is the stone which was set at naught of you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved."

This must be apparent to any one who will reflect for a moment on the true state of the case. We are all descended from the same parentage, are partakers of a common nature and heirs of a common degeneracy. Descended from Adam by ordinary generation, we all "sinned in him, and fell with him in his first transgression." Since, then, we are partakers in "a common heritage of woe," have the same hearts of wickedness, and are alike candidates for immortality, it was right and proper, yes, necessary, that God should give the same revelation to all. Hence, the same Bible is suited to the salvation of Asia, of Africa, of Europe and of America.

In making a plan of salvation, God was making it not merely for one nation, but for a whole world. It was to be adapted to all the human race, because they were in a like condemnation. They are all suffering from the same deadly malady, and for that malady there is but one remedy, suited to all, and which must be applied to all who are to be finally saved.

Thus have we tried briefly to show that the word of the Lord

is settled forever. It can never be altered or amended. It can never be changed or modified. It partakes of the grand and unique character of him who wrote it. It has the stamp of his own unsullied perfection about it. He has concentrated in it his own infinite wisdom, and he intends to make known in it all that is needful to make men happy on earth and happy in heaven. There is no improvement that can possibly be made to it. God has said all that he thought was necessary to be said. He has written just what his infinite wisdom dictated, and he does not intend to improve that revelation to suit the imagined improvement of the human intellect. Men may warp and twist its doctrines to suit their own conceptions, and may try to adapt it to their own preconceived theories. God will not directly interfere with them while doing so, but it would be well for all such to meditate on these closing words of the Bible: "If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the books of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life and out of the holy city and from the things which are written in this book."

PRACTICAL INFERENCES.

The mere discussion of what may be regarded an abstract question like this is useless unless we can deduce from it what will be of practical importance. But, properly looked at, the truths here taught are the very foundation of the christian religion. The Bible is our "only infallible rule of faith and practice," and if that be liable to any change, there is no stability in the kingdom of Christ; there is no fixedness, no definiteness, about christian principles, and no right and wrong about christian practice. But if the word of the Lord is settled forever, then

(a.) All the great doctrines of the Bible are fixed and eternal. We do not mean that all the points which are involved in what is known as speculative theology are necessarily fixed and eternal. These may vary, and have varied, with different degrees of intelligence. But wherever we find a doctrine that is clearly taught in the "word of God," there is "the end of all controversy." Explain

it, modify it, speculate upon it as we please, still it is fixed and unalterable. It may not meet with universal acceptance, but may be rejected by large denominations of christians. It may be differently understood and expounded. It may be beyond the reach of human reason, so that we can scarcely apprehend, much less comprehend it. Still, if it is clearly and unmistakably a doctrine of revelation, we are bound to accept it and to act upon it. In all such cases we are obliged to kneel, with uncovered heads, and say: "Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth."

Of such doctrines we reckon "the Trinity." This is perfectly incomprehensible by the human mind, and yet it is taught in the Bible. And so we might speak of the "divine-human nature" of our Saviour. And then we find here "the fall of man," "original sin," "total depravity," "predestination and election," "regeneration," "justification by faith," "sanctification," "the perseverance of the saints," "the resurrection of the dead," "the final judgment," "the everlasting joys of the saved and the everlasting punishment of the lost."

These and such as these are distinctive doctrines of revelation. They are taught in God's Word, not formulated as dogmas in distinctive language, but taught there as truths not to be denied. Some of them may come in conflict with our "intuitive convictions," and may seem to contradict the reason of some and to be beyond the power and scope of thought. But if they are taught in God's own book, they are fixed, settled, eternal. We must accept them on faith, although we may not know how to explain them. We must receive them as what God has taught, as a blind man must believe what another man with good eyes tells him he can see. If there is a plain "thus saith the Lord" to substantiate them, then loyalty to God demands that we accept and heartily believe them.

(b.) The moral law as laid down in the Bible is forever the same. Its principles are fixed and eternal. The law of God was originally stamped upon human nature by God himself in creation. It is true that the law was somewhat obliterated by sin, and hence God had to rewrite it upon tables of stone. But even now we read, "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against

all ungodliness, and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness." "For as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law"—*i. e.*, the written law; "and as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law." "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the law, are a law unto themselves. Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing, or else excusing one another."

Here, then, is a clear intimation of the fact that the law of God was written upon the original constitution of man, and of course it must last and be in full force as long as man's nature shall continue. We are told that Christ came "not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it," "to magnify it, and make it honorable." And Paul, anticipating some objections that might be made to the doctrine of "justification by faith," says: "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; nay, we establish the law." So far from detracting from its claims and removing its obligations, we magnify these claims, and enforce its universal obligations. We recognize the fact, that every creature is under law to the Creator; that every human being is bound to obey all the requirements of God. And especially do we hold that every christian is obliged to look upon the decalogue as "the rule of his life." He is not only bound by law, but bound by love and gratitude to be loyal to him "who loved us, and gave himself for us."

The truth of the matter is, that the precepts and penalties of God's law are as fixed and eternal as God's own nature. The angels are under law, and they lose not their first estate in heaven by reason of their perfect obedience. Every christian will be under law in heaven also. In other words, the law of God never will be, never can be, abrogated, because it is but a reprint of God's own holy nature. It is not to be changed by any of the mutations of earth, because it is independent of all human legislation. God himself framed these laws for the good of his own creatures. Love to God and love to man is the sum and substance of that law; and so, while God lasts and man lasts, this law will be as fixed and eternal as God the law-maker. "Forever, O Lord, thy word is SETTLED in heaven."

T. W. HOOPER.

III. ANTI-BIBLICAL THEORIES OF RIGHTS.

WHEN the friends of the Bible win a victory over one phase of infidelity, they naturally hope that there will be a truce in the warfare and they may enjoy peace. But the hope is ill-founded. We should have foreseen this, had we considered that the real source of infidelity is always in the pride, self-will and ungodliness of man's nature. So that, when men are defeated on one line of attack, a part of them at least will be certainly prompted by their natural enmity to God's word to hunt for some other weapon against it. Rational deism, from Bolingbroke to Hume, received a Waterloo defeat at the hands of Bishop Butler and the other christian apologists, and well-informed enemies surrendered it. But neology raised its head, and for two generations opened a way for virtual infidels. History and biblical criticism in the hands of the Bengels, Delitzschs, Leuthards, have blocked that way, and Tübingen is silent, or at least discredited. Then came the anti-Mosaic geology and evolution—the one attacking the recent origin of man, the flood, etc., the other presuming to construct a creation without a creator. These two are now passing into the "sere and yellow leaf." More correct natural science now points with certainty to a deluge, to the recency of the last glacial epoch, the newness of the present face of the continents, and consequently to the late appearance of man upon the earth. Agassiz, M. Paul Janet and Sir William Dawson reinstate the doctrines of final cause and fixed genera of organic life upon their impregnable basis.

But we may expect no respite in the warfare. Another hostile banner is already unfurled, and has gathered its millions of unbelievers for a new attack upon God's Holy Word. This assault proceeds from the side of professed social science. It appears in those dogmas of social rights which are historically known as the Jacobinical, and which have been transferred from the atheistic French radicals to the free Protestant countries. The object of the Scriptures is to teach the way of redemption and sanctification for sinful man; yet incidentally they teach, by precept and implication, those

equitable principles on which all constitutional governments are founded. So far as God gave to the chosen people a political form, the one which he preferred was a confederation of little republican bodies represented by their elderships. (Ex. xviii. 25, 26; Ex. iii. 16; Num. xi. 16, 17; Num. xxxii. 20-27.)

When he conceded to them, as it were under protest, a regal form, it was a constitutional and elective monarchy. (1 Sam. x. 24, 25.) The rights of each tribe were secured against vital infringement of this constitution by its own veto power. They retained the prerogative of protecting themselves against the usurpations of the elective king by withdrawing at their own sovereign discretion from the confederation. (1 Kings, xii. 13-16.)

The history of the secession of the ten tribes under Jeroboam is often misunderstood through gross carelessness. No divine disapprobation is anywhere expressed against the ten tribes for exercising their right of withdrawal from the perverted federation. When Rehoboam began a war of coercion he was sternly forbidden by God to pursue it. (1 Kings, xii. 24.)

The act by which "Jeroboam made Israel to sin against the Lord" was wholly another and subsequent one—his meddling with the divinely appointed constitution of the church to promote merely political ends. (1 Kings, xii. 26-28.)

Thus, while the Bible history does not prohibit stronger forms of government as sins *per se*, it indicates God's preference for the representative republic as distinguished from the levelling democracy; and to this theory of human rights all its moral teachings correspond. On the one hand, it constitutes civil society of superiors, inferiors, and equals (see Shorter Catechism, Question 64), making the household represented by the parent and master the integral unit of the social fabric, assigning to each order, higher or lower, its rule or subordination under the distributive equity of the law. On the other hand, it protected each order in its legal privileges, and prohibited oppression and injustice as to all.

In a word, the maxim of the scriptural social ethics may be justly expressed in the great words of the British Constitution, "Peer and peasant are equal before the law," which were the guide of a Pym, a Hampden, a Sydney, a Locke, a Chatham, and equally of Har-

cock, Adams, Washington, Mason and Henry. Their theory assigned to the different classes of human beings in the commonwealth different grades of privilege and of function, according to their different natures and qualifications; but it held that the inferior is shielded in his right to his smaller franchise, by the same relation to the common heavenly Father, by the same Golden Rule and the equitable right which shields the superior in the enjoyment of his larger powers. The functions and privileges of the peer are in some respects very different from those of the peasant; but the same law protects them both in their several rights, and commands them both as to their several duties. This theory thus established between all men a moral, but not a mechanical equality. Higher and lower hold alike the same relation to the supreme ruler and ordainer of the commonwealth, God; yet they hold different relations to each other in society, corresponding to their differing capacities and fitnesses, which equity itself demands. Job understood this maxim of Bible republicanism, as he shows (chap. xxxi. 13, 14, 15): "If I did despise the cause of my manservant or of my maidservant, when they contended with me; what, then, shall I do when God riseth up? and when he visiteth, what shall I answer him? Did not he that made me in the womb make him?" So Paul, two thousand years later, (Eph. vi. 9; Col. iv. 1). *Κἀντις* give to your *δούλους* those things which are just and equal. The two teach the same doctrine. On the one hand, they assert the relation of superior and inferior, with their unequal franchises; on the other hand, they assert in the same breath the equal moral obligation of both as bearing the common relation to the one divine maker and judge.

The radical social theory asserts, under the same name, a totally different doctrine; its maxim is "all men are born free and equal." It supposes the social fabric constituted of individuals naturally absolute and sovereign as its integers, and this by some sort of social contract, in entering which individual men act with a freedom equally complete as to God and each other. It defines each one's natural liberty as freedom to do whatever he wishes, and his civil liberty, after he optionally enters society, as that remainder of his natural prerogative not surrendered to the social contract.

Consequently the theory teaches that exactly the same surrender must be exacted of each one under this social contract, whence each individual is inalienably entitled to all the same franchises and functions in society as well as to his moral equality; so that it is a natural iniquity to withhold from any adult person by law any prerogative which is legally conferred on any other member in society. The equality must be mechanical as well as moral, else the society is charged with natural injustice.

Every fair mind sees that this is not only a different but an opposite social theory. Yet its advocates are accustomed to advance it as the equivalent of the other, to teach it under the same nomenclature, and to assert that the difference between them is purely visionary. So widespread and profound is this confusion of thought, that the majority of the American people and of their teachers practically know and hold no other theory than the Jacobin one. They assume, as a matter of course, that it is this theory which is the firm logical basis of constitutional government; whereas history and science show that it is a fatal heresy of thought, which uproots every possible foundation of just freedom, and grounds only the most ruthless despotism. But none the less is this the passionate belief of millions, for the sake of which they are willing to assail the Bible itself.

The least reflection points out that this theory involves the following corollaries: (1,) There can be no just imputation of the consequences of conduct from one human being to another in society; (2,) No adult person can be justly debarred from any privilege allowed to any other person in the order or society, except for conviction of crime; (3,) All distinctions of "caste" are essentially and inevitably wicked and oppressive; (4,) Of course every adult is equally entitled to the franchise of voting and being voted for, and all restrictions here, except for the conviction of crime, are natural injustice; (5,) Equal rights and suffrage ought to be conceded to women in every respect as to men. If any advocate of the Jacobin theory recoils from this corollary, he is absolutely inconsistent, by reason of his bondage to former prejudices and unreasoning habits of thought: so argues John Stuart Mill irrefragably in his treatise on the "Subjection of

Women." If the Jacobin theory be true, then woman must be allowed access to every male avocation, including government, and war if she wishes it, to suffrage, to every political office, to as absolute freedom from her husband in the marriage relation as she enjoyed before her union to him, and to as absolute control of her own property and earnings as that claimed by the single gentleman, as against her own husband. That Mill infers correctly from his premises needs no arguing. If it is a just principle that no adult male shall be debarred from suffrage or office by reason of "race, color, or previous condition of bondage," then indisputably no adult female can be justly debarred from them by reason of sex, or previous legal subjection under the "common law." If it is a natural injustice to debar an adult male from these rights because of a black or yellow face, it must be an equal injustice to debar other adults because of a beardless face. If kinky hair should not disfranchise, then by parative reasoning flowing tresses should not disfranchise. (6.) Last, if the Jacobin theory be true, then slavery in all its forms must be essentially unrighteous; of which institution the essential feature is, that citizens are invested with property in the involuntary labor of adult human beings, and control over their persons. The absolute necessity of this corollary is now asserted by all who hold the Jacobin theory intelligently: as, for instance, by Mr. Mill. They invariably deduce their doctrine from those principles, and they say, that since those principles are established, argument on the subject of human bondage is absolutely closed; and history gives this curious illustration of the necessity of this logical connection: that the first application of the doctrine of theoretical abolitionism ever made was that applied by Robespierre, the master of the French Jacobins, to the French colonies. We are told that he prided himself much on his political philosophy, and that one day when he was expounding it in the national assembly, some one said: "Monsieur, those dogmas, if carried out, would require the emancipation of all the Africans in the colonies, which would, of course, ruin those precious appendages of France." To which he angrily replied: "Then let the colonies perish, rather than this social philosophy shall be denied." Of which the result was, in fact, the St. Domingo of to-day.

Now my purpose in this essay is not at all to discuss these two theories of human right, or to refute the latter and establish the former. Although such discussion would strictly belong to the science of moral philosophy, and is indeed a vital part thereof, the fastidious might perhaps deem it unfit for a theological review, in these "piping times of peace." My sole object is to examine the scriptural question, whether or not the integrity of the Bible can be made to consist with the Jacobin theory and its necessary corollaries; and this inquiry is purely religious and theological. The christian church as such has no direct didactic concern with it, and no legislative and judicial concern with it, except as it furnishes infidelity weapons to assail God's word. Our church has always properly held, that whenever any science so-called, whether psychological, moral, or even physical, is used to assail the integrity of the rule of faith, that use at once makes the defensive discussion of that hostile science a theological function, both proper and necessary for the church. I cite from our Confession a notable instance: For centuries the psychological problem concerning the rise of volition had been debated between philosophers, the Scotists approving, and the Thomists denying, the equilibrium and self-determination of the will. The Westminster Assembly perceived that the Scotists' psychology was employed to sophisticate the revealed doctrines of original sin and effectual calling. They, therefore, in chap. ix., "Of Free Will," determine and settle so much of this doctrine of psychology as is needed to substantiate the Scriptures. So, recently, our Assembly, upon perceiving that a doctrine of mere physical science, evolution, was liable to be used for impugning the testimony of Scripture, dealt with that foreign doctrine both didactically and judicially. They were consistent. For, I repeat, whenever any doctrine from any whither is employed to assail that divine testimony which our Lord has committed to the church, there the defensive discussion of that doctrine has become theological, and is an obligatory part of the church's divine testimony.

But my purpose does not go so far as even this. My object is merely to point out the coming contest, and to warn the defenders of the faith of its certainty. My wish is to make all christians

face this plain question: Will you surrender the inspiration of the Scriptures to these assaults of a social science so-called? If not, what? That the issue has been made and must be met, I shall show by laying two sets of facts alongside of each other. One is, that the Jacobin theory, already held by millions and confidently claiming for itself all the honors of republicanism and liberty, does assert, and must assert, all the corollaries above stated. The other set of facts is, that the Scriptures deny every one of them, and that with a fatal distinctness which no honest exposition can evade. Doubtless, during this long and tremendous conflict, we shall see the same thing repeated which we have seen in recent decades: timid and uncandid minds, anxious still to "ride a fence" after it is totally blown away by the hurricane of anti-christian attack, attempting to reconcile opposites by various exegetical wriggings. But we shall again see it end in futility, and candid assailant and candid defender will both agree that the Bible means what it says, and must either fall squarely or must stand by the overthrow of all attacking parties. The rest of our work will therefore be little more than the examinations of the actual teachings of Scripture.

1. The Jacobin theory totally repudiates all imputation of the consequences of moral conduct from one person to another as irrational and essentially unjust. It declares that "imputed guilt is imputed nonsense." From its premises it must declare thus, for it asserts that each individual enters social existence as an independent integer, possessed of complete natural liberty and full equality. But the Bible scheme of social existence is full of this imputation. I shall not dwell upon the first grand case, the sin and fall of the race in Adam, although it is still determining, in a tremendous manner, the conditions of each individual's entrance into social existence. I add other instances, some of which are equally extensive. "The woman was first in the transgression," for which God laid upon Eve two penalties (Gen. iii. 16), subordination to her husband and the sorrows peculiar to motherhood. The New Testament declares (1 Tim. ii. 11 to end) that it is right her daughters shall continue to endure these penalties to the end of the world. (See also 1 Peter, iii. 1-6.) In Genesis ix. 25-27, Ham,

the son of Noah, is guilty of an unfilial crime. His posterity are condemned with him and share the penalty to this day. In Ex. xx. 5, God declares that he will visit the iniquity of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generations. Amalek met Israel in the time of his flight and distress with robbery and murder, instead of hospitality. Not only were the immediate actors punished by Joshua, but the descendants of Amalek are excluded forever from the house of the Lord, for the crime of their fathers. (Dent. xxv. 19.) It is needless to multiply instances, except one more, which shall refute the favorite dream of the rationalists that Jesus substituted a milder and juster law. For this Jesus said to the Jews of his own day (Matt. xxiii. 32-36): "Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers: . . . that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. Verily I say unto you, all these things shall come upon this generation." We thus find this principle of imputation extended into the New Testament, by the authority of Jesus himself, as a just principle.

2. Whereas Jacobinism asserts that no privilege or franchise enjoyed by some adults in the state can be justly withheld from any other order of adults, God's word entirely discards this rule. Not to speak of the subordination of women and domestic bondage (of which more anon), God distributed the franchises unequally in the Hebrew commonwealth. The priestly family possessed, by inheritance, certain teaching and ruling functions which the descendants of no other tribe could share. There was a certain law of primogeniture, entitled the right of the first-born, which the younger sons did not share equally, and which the father himself could not alienate. (Dent. xxi. 15, 16.) The fathers of houses (Ex. xviii. 21; Josh. xxii. 14), in virtue of their patriarchal authority, held a senatorial dignity, and this evidently for life. (See also the history of Barzillai.)

In the New Testament, the apostle Peter (1 Ep. ii. 13) enjoins christians to submit themselves "to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the king as supreme, or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment

of evil-doers and for the praise of them that do well." Here a distribution of powers between different ranks, emperor, proconsuls, and subjects, is distinctly recognized. "Render, therefore, to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor." (Rom. xiii. 7.) "Likewise, also, these filthy dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities." (Jude, 8.)

3. Nothing is more obnoxious to the principles of Jacobinism than what it denounces as "caste." It delights to use this word because it is freighted with bad associations derived from the stories we hear of the oppressive hereditary distinctions of the people in Hindostan. Of course there is a sense in which every just conscience reprehends inequalities of caste. This is, where they are made pretext for depriving an order or class of citizens of privileges which belong to them of right, and for whose exercise they are morally and intellectually qualified. But this is entirely a different thing from saying that all the different orders of persons in a state are naturally and morally entitled to all the same privileges, whether qualified or not, simply because they are men and adults. The Jacobin trick of sophistry is to confound these different propositions together; and when they denounce "wicked caste," the application they make of their denunciation includes not only oppressive inequalities, but every difference in the distribution of powers and privileges. Now, the Scriptures recognize and ordain such distribution; or, if the reader pleases, such distinctions of caste in the latter sense. Such is the stubborn fact. Thus, in the Hebrew commonwealth, the descendants of Levi were disfranchised of one privilege which belonged to all their brethren of the other tribes; and enfranchised with another privilege from which all their brethren were excluded. A Levite could not hold an inch of land in severalty. (Num. xviii. 22, 23.) No member of another tribe, not even of the princely tribe of Judah, could perform even the lowest function in the tabernacle. (Heb. vii. 13, 14.) These differences are nowhere grounded in any statement that the children of Levi were more or less intelligent and religious than their fellow-citizens. Another "caste distinction" appears among the descendants of Levi himself. The sons

of Aaron alone could offer sacrifices or incense in the sanctuary. The Levites could only be underlings or assistants to their brethren the priests. Among the sons of Aaron another hereditary distinction presents itself. The individual who had the right of the first born took the high priesthood, with its superior prerogatives. He alone could go into the Holy of Holies. He alone could offer the sacrifice on the great annual day of atonement. But this privilege was limited by a certain hereditary disqualification. He could only marry a virgin (Lev. xxi. 13, 14), and was forbidden to marry a widow (as his fellow citizens might legally do), however virtuous and religious. A "caste distinction" is also found among the bondmen, whose subjection was legalized by the constitution. A person of Hebrew blood could only be enslaved for six years. A person of foreign blood could be held in hereditary slavery, although born within the land of Israel as much as the other. It was also provided that the treatment of bondmen of Hebrew blood should be more lenient. (Lev. xxv. 42-47.) A "caste distinction" was also provided concerning the entrance of persons of foreign blood into the Hebrew state and church. (Exodus xvii. 16; Deut. xxiii. 3-8.) The descendants of Amalek were forever inhibited. The descendants of Ammon and Moab were debarred to the tenth generation. The Egyptians and Edomites could be admitted at the third generation; the one, because their patriarch Esau was brother to Jacob, the other, because the Israelites had once lived in Egypt.

Let the inference from these histories be clearly understood. It is not claimed that these caste distinctions established by God himself obligate us positively to establish similar distinctions in our day. But the fact that God once saw fit to establish them does prove that they cannot be essentially sinful. To assert that they are, impugns the righteousness of God. Whence it follows, in direct opposition to the Jacobin theory, that should suitable circumstances again arise such "caste distinctions" may be righteous. It will be exclaimed that the New Testament reversed all this. We shall be reminded of Paul's famous declaration (Col. iii. 11): "Where there is neither Jew nor Greek, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but Christ is

all and in all"; or this (Gal. iii. 28): "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." But before a literal and mechanical equality can be inferred from these, it must be settled what the Holy Spirit meant by being "one in Christ," and whether the parts which are combined to construct a component unity are not always unequal instead of equal. The latter is certainly the apostle's teaching when he compares the spiritual body to the animal body, with many members of dissimilar honor. The apostle himself demonstrates that he never designed the levelling sense to be put upon his words by proceeding after he had uttered them to subject women in one sense to an inequality by imposing upon them ecclesiastical subordination, and even a different dress, in the church. The Scriptures thus teach that all distinctions of caste are not unjust in the sense charged by the current theory.

4. God's commonwealth was not founded on universal suffrage. That he rejected the Jacobinical principle is plain from the history of the Gibeonites. They were exempted by covenant with Joshua from the doom of extinction, and retained a title to homes for many generations upon the soil of Palestine, and, as we see from 2 Sam. xxi. 6, they were very carefully protected in certain rights by the government. They were not domestic slaves, neither were they fully enfranchised citizens. From the higher franchises of that rank they were shut out by a hereditary disqualification, and this was done by God's express enactment. (Josh. ix. 27.) This instance impinges against the Jacobin theory in two other ways, indicated in our second and third heads. Individual descendants of the Gibeonites, however law-abiding and gifted with natural capacity, did not enjoy "*la carrière ouverte aux talents*" equally with the young Israelites, which the Jacobin theory demands indiscriminately as the inalienable right of all. And to make the matter worse, the Scripture declares that this disqualification descended by imputation from the guilt of the first generation's paganism and fraud upon Joshua.

5. We have shown that the claim known as that of women's rights is an inevitable corollary of the radical theory. Our purpose here is not to debate the wisdom or equity of that claim, but to

show what God thinks of it. In Gen. iii. 16, he legislates for Eve as the representative of all her daughters, putting her in subordination to the authority of her husband: "Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee." If a Hebrew landholder had male descendants when he died, his daughters inherited no share in his land. They could inherit land in cases where there was no male heir. And this was the legislation, not of Moses, but of God himself. (Num. xxvii. 8.) It is more decisive to add, that the New Testament continues to assign subordination to women. 1 Cor. xi. 3: "The head of the woman is the man." 1 Cor. xiv. 34: "Let your women keep silence in the churches, for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law." Eph. v. 22-24: "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord, for the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church. . . . Therefore, as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything." 1 Tim. ii. 11, 12: "Let the woman learn in silence, with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence," (*οὐδὲ ἀδυνατεῖν ἀνδρὸς*, "nor to dominate man." The concept of usurpation is only implicit in the Greek verb.) 1 Tim. v. 14: "I will, therefore, that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully." Titus, ii. 4, 5: "That they may teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children, to be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed." 1 Pet. iii. 1, 5, 6: "Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands, that if any obey not the word they also without the word may be won by the conversation of the wives; for after this manner in the old time the holy women also, who trusted in God, adorned themselves, being in subjection to their own husbands, even as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord."

Thus, explicit and repeated, are the precepts of the Scripture on this head. In the new dispensation they are even plainer than in the old. How many thousands of women are there, professed mem-

bers of Christ's church, who rid themselves of all these precepts with a disdainful toss, saying: "Oh, Paul was but a crusty old bachelor. It was the men who legislated thus in their pride of sex. Had women written, all would have been different." I would request such fair reasoners to look this question steadily in the face. Is this the legislation of men, or of God speaking by men? If they say the former, is not this virtual infidelity? If the latter, had they not better take care, "lest haply they be found even fighting against God," instead of against a "crusty old bachelor?"

One of the weak evasions attempted is to plead that this subordination of the women of Peter's and Paul's day was enjoined only because of their low grade of intelligence and morality, these female christians being supposed to be but sorry creatures, recently converted from paganism. The apostles refute this, as does church history, both of which give the highest praise to the christian women of the primitive church. Especially does the apostle Peter ruin this sophism when he illustrates the duty of obedience by the godly example of the noblest princesses of Israel's heroic age.

6. The sixth and last issue between Jacobinism and the inspiration of Scripture, is concerning the lawfulness of domestic slavery. The two sides of this issue are defined with perfect sharpness. The political theory says the subjection of one human being in bondage to another, except for conviction of crime, is essentially and always unrighteous. The Scriptures indisputably declare, in both Testaments, that it is not always essentially unrighteous; since they legitimate it under suitable circumstances, and declare that godly masters may so hold the relation as to make it equitable and righteous. I shall not now go fully into the scriptural argument on this point, because my whole object is gained by showing that the contradiction exists, without discussing which side has the right, and because I have so fully discussed the whole question in my "Defence of Virginia and the South." It is only necessary to name the leading facts: (*a*.) That God predicted the rise of the institution of domestic bondage, as the penalty and remedy for the bad morals of those subjected to it (Gen. ix. 25); (*b*.) That God protects property in slaves, ex-

actly as any other kind of property, in the sacred decalogue itself (Ex. xx. 17); (c,) That numerous slaves were bestowed on Abraham, the "friend of God," as marks of the favor of divine providence (Gen. xxiv. 35); (d,) That the relation of master and bondman was sanctified by the administration of a divine sacrament, which the bondman received on the ground of the master's faith (Gen. xvii. 27); (e,) That the angel of the covenant himself remanded a fugitive slave, Hagar, to her mistress, but afterwards assisted her in the same journey when legally manumitted (Gen. xxi. 17-21); (f,) That the civil laws of Moses expressly allowed Hebrew citizens to purchase pagans as life-long and hereditary slaves (Lev. xxv. 44-46); (g,) That the law declares such slaves (*i. e.*, their involuntary labor) to be property. The reader is advised to consult here the irrefragable exegesis of Dr. Moses Stuart, of Andover. He will see that this argument is no construction of sectional prejudice. The New Testament left the institution with precisely the same sanction as the Old. Were there any ground for the plea that the Old Testament also legalized polygamy and capricious divorce, which we now regard as immoral, this fact would utterly refute it. For while the New Testament prohibited these wrongs it left slavery untouched. But I also deny that the Old Testament anywhere legalized polygamy and capricious divorce. To charge it in the sense of this evasive plea impugns the inspiration of Moses and the prophets. That is to say, it is virtual infidelity. And this infidel assault upon Moses and the prophets equally attacks Christ and his apostles. It is vain to advance the theory (which is but the old Socinian theory) that the New Testament corrected and amended whatever was harsh or barbarous in the Old. For, in the first place, I utterly deny the assertion. The New Testament left the relation of master and bondman just where Moses placed it. And, in the second place, Jesus and his apostles expressly guarantee the inspiration of Moses, without any reservation, (see Luke xvi. 31; John v. 46; Luke xxiv. 26, 27; 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17; John xii. 36; Acts xxviii. 25; Heb. iii. 7; 2 Peter i. 21;) so that they have embarked their credit, as divine and infallible teachers, along with that of Moses. Both must stand or fall together. Whenever a person declares that whatsoever he

speaks is given to him to speak from God (John xvii. 8), and then assures us that another person has spoken infallibly and divinely; upon ascertaining that the latter has in fact spoken erroneously and immorally, we can only condemn the former as both mistaken and dishonest. (The blasphemy is not mine!) This stubborn corollary every clear mind must draw sooner or later; and not all the rationalistic glozings of deceitful exegesis can prevent it. He who attacks the inspiration of Moses attacks also the inspiration and the moral character of Jesus. "No man can serve two masters." Let every one make up his mind honestly, either to reject the Bible as a fable, and thus preserve his Jacobin humanitarianism, or frankly to surrender the latter, in order to retain the gospel.

But let us see what the New Testament says concerning the relation of master and bondman. It does indeed command all, if they assume this relation, to fulfil it in a christian spirit, in the fear of an impartial God. (Eph. vi. 9.) It also prohibits all unrighteous abuses of the relation, whether by masters (Col. iv. 1) or by bondmen. (Col. iii. 22-25.) Slave-holders, like the godless centurion (Luke vii. 2-9) and Cornelius (Acts x. 34, 35), are commended for their christian consistency, without a word of caution or exception, on account of this relation. The Redeemer, in Luke xvii. 7-10, grounds his argument to prove that not even the truest christian obedience can bring God in our debt, upon a logical analogy, whose very point is that the master is legally invested with a prior title to, and property in, the labor of his bondman. In the beautiful parable of the prodigal son (Luke xv. 19), when Christ would illustrate the thoroughness of his contrition, he does it by using the acknowledged fact that the condition of the hired servant in the slave-holder's household was the lowest and least privileged, *i. e.*, the δούλος was above the μισθωτός. The apostles enjoin on bondmen conscientious service to their masters, even when unjust (1 Pet. ii. 18, 19); but so much the more willing and conscientious when those masters are brother members in the christian church. (1 Tim. vi. 1, 2.) The apostle Paul holds that, if masters do their duty, the relation may be lawfully continued, and is just and equitable. The apostle Paul remands a

fugitive slave to his master Philemon, after that slave's conversion, and that although he is at the time in great need of the assistance of such a servant. And so distinctly does he recognize Philemon's lawful property in the involuntary labor of his fugitive slave that he actually binds himself, in writing, to pay its pecuniary value himself, that thereby he may gain free forgiveness for Onesimus. In 1 Tim. vi. 3-5, the apostle condemns such as would dare to dispute the righteous obligation of even christian bondmen, as proud, ignorant, perverse, contentious, untruthful, corrupt in mind and mercenary; and he requires believers to separate themselves from such teachers.

The glosses which attempt to evade these clear declarations are well known. They assert that, though Christ and his apostles knew that the relation was intrinsically wicked, they forebore to condemn it expressly, on account of its wide prevalence, the jealousy of owners, the dangers of popular convulsions and politic caution; while they secretly provided for its extinction by inculcating gospel principles in general. Such is the most decent reconciliation, which even the pious and evangelical Scott can find between his Bible and his politics. Every perspicacious mind sees that it is false to all the facts of the history, dishonorable to Christ, and inconsistent with all true conceptions of his inspiration and Messiahship. He and his apostles absolutely deny that they keep back any percept from any consideration of policy or caution. (John xvii. 8; Acts xx. 20, 27.) They expressly repudiate this theory of their mission, as though they had this deceitful theory then before their eyes. They invariably attack other evils, such as idolatry, polygamy, and impurity, which were far more prevalent and more strongly intrenched in prejudices than domestic slavery. They ground the spread and protection of their gospel on the omnipotence of God, not on the policy of men, and reject with a lofty and holy disdain all this species of paltering to sin which this gloss imputes to them.

The honest student, then, of the New Testament can make nothing less of its teachings on this point than that domestic slavery, as defined in God's word and practiced in the manner enjoined in the Epistles, is still a lawful relation under the new dis-

compensation as well as under the old. Let me be allowed to pause here, and add a few words in explanation of the relation which the orthodox Presbyterian Church in America has always held to this subject. Since domestic bondage is a civic and secular relation, which God has declared may be lawfully held under suitable conditions, the church may not prohibit it categorically to her members nor may she interfere with the commonwealth by her spiritual authority, either to institute it or to abolish it. Had her Lord declared it to be intrinsically sinful, then it would have been her duty to prohibit it to her members, and to enforce this prohibition by her spiritual discipline, in spite of the commonwealth's allowance, or even positive injunction. The church and her presbyters, then, have no concern to favor or oppose this civic relation, but only to protect the integrity of her divine rule of faith as involved in the debate concerning it. Her only other concern with it is so to evangelize masters and bondmen as to make the relation a blessing to both, and to retrench all its sinful abuses. Now, then, if the opponents of this relation object to it and urge its overthrow on the ground that it is economically less profitable or less promotive of economic advantage than the hireling systems of labor, we, as presbyters, have nothing whatever to say, although fully aware that the testimony of facts and the government itself have repeatedly contradicted that position. Had its opponents claimed any legal or constitutional arguments entitling them to meddle with it or restrict it in States other than their own, we, as presbyters, should have been absolutely silent. Had its opponents asserted that we were grievously neglecting the duties of the relation and permitting abuses of it so as to impair the happiness of our dependent fellow-creatures, and to displease the God of the poor, we, as christians, should have bowed meekly, as to the faithful rebuke of friends, and should have been thankful for their aid and instruction to teach us how to use the relation more righteously and mercifully. It is when they assert that the relation is intrinsically wicked, and that even its maintenance without abuses is to be condemned by the spiritual authority of the church and prevented by her discipline, that they obtrude the issue, and the one issue, which we, as presbyters, are entitled and bound to meet; for they thereby

assail the morality, and thus the truth, of those Scriptures which God has given to the church as her testimony, which, if she does not uphold, she ceases to be a church, and "they teach for doctrines the commandments of men," which Christ prohibits his church either to do or to endure. What I thus declare concerning this last point of domestic bondage I now also assert concerning the five previous ones. The church has no commission to advocate or to oppose any political doctrines, logical or illogical, Jacobinical, republican, or royalist, as such. It is only when they are so advanced as to taint the integrity of her divine rule of faith that they concern her, and then her concern is only to defend the testimony her Lord has committed to her, which she must do against "all comers," be their pretext what it may.

It is from this point of view that I say it behooves the watchman upon the walls of Zion to consider and estimate the extent of the danger now arising from this source. If they observe intelligently they will see that peril is portentous. They will detect this radical theory of human rights and equality, born of atheism, but masquerading in the garb of true Bible republicanism, everywhere teaching corollaries—which they teach inevitably because they follow necessarily from their first principles—which contradict the express teachings of Scripture. We see this theory passionately held by millions of nominal christians in the most Protestant lands, perhaps by the great majority of such, with the blind and passionate devotion of partisanship. Every sensible man knows the power of political partisanship as one of the most difficult things in the world to overcome, by either truth or conscience. Hence, we have no right to be surprised that this collision between the popular political theory, so flattering to the self-will and pride of the human heart, and so clad in the raiment of pretended philanthropy on the one part, and the Holy Scriptures on the other part, requiring men, as they do, to bow their pride and self-will to a divine authority, has become the occasion of tens of thousands making themselves blatant infidels, and of millions becoming virtual unbelievers. Those who wish to hold both the contradictories have indeed been busy for two generations weaving veils of special pleadings and deceitful expositions of

Scripture, wherewith to conceal the inevitable contradiction. But these veils are continually wearing too thin to hide it, and the bolder minds rend them one after another and cast them away. The only permanent effect of these sophisms is to damage the respectability of the christian bodies and scholars who employ them, and to debauch their own intellectual honesty. Meantime, the authority of Holy Scripture as an infallible rule of faith sinks lower and lower with the masses of Protestant christendom. Is it not now a rarity to find a christian of culture who reads his Bible with the full faith which his grandparents were wont to exercise; and when an educated man now-a-days avows that he still does so, does he not excite a stare from other christians? The recent history of the church presents startling instances of this departure of her spiritual power and glory. When the fashion of the day betrayed the excellent Dr. Thomas Scott into the insertion of the wretched sophism exposed above, in his commentary on the Epistles, the "Evangelical party" in the Anglican Church was powerful, respectable and useful. It stood in the forefront of English christianity, boasting a galaxy of the greatest British divines, statesmen and scholars. Now, who so poor as to do it reverence? Romanizers, Ritualists, Broad Churchmen, in the Anglican body, speak of it as a dead donkey, and glory over its impotency. So the great evangelical Baptist body was a glorious bulwark of the gospel in the days of Robert Hall, Ryland, and Andrew Fuller. To-day we see it so honey-combed with rationalism that Mr. Spurgeon can no longer give the Baptist Union the countenance of his orthodoxy; and he testifies that attacks may be heard from its pulpits upon every distinctively evangelical point. What is it that has so wofully tainted these once so excellent bodies? Is not a part of the answer to be found here: that the Quaker Clarkson, with his pretended inner light his preferred guide rather than God's written word, and his Socinianizing theory of inspiration in attacking the British and New England slave trade (which deserved his attack), also attacked the relation of domestic servitude with indiscriminate rage, and supported his rationalism with arguments of human invention, piously borrowed even from French atheism? British christianity, awakened at last

to tardy remorse for the bad eminence of their race as the leading slave catchers of the world, was seized with a colic-spasm of virtue on that subject, and very naturally sought to atone for its iniquities in the one extreme by rushing into the other. Thus it not only aimed to seize the glory of suppressors of the African slave trade—a glory which belonged to Virginia, first of all the commonwealths of the world, by a prior title of forty years—but became fanatically abolitionist. Then the problem for evangelical fanatics was how to reconcile their anti-scriptural dogma with the Scriptures. With this problem Exeter Hall christianity has been wrestling for fifty years by the deplorable methods above described, and while they have not made the reconciliation, they have succeeded by those methods in making the world skeptical of their sincerity, and in sowing broadcast the seeds of a licentious rationalism. Their pupils, when taught to interpret the unpalatable political truth out of the declarations of Jesus, Moses and Paul, continue to use the same slippery methods to interpret the unpalatable theological truths also out of the Bible, as depravity, predestination, gratuitous justification, inability, eternal retribution.

The most sorrowful aspect of the matter is that, as fast as the candor of these christians forces them to recognize the contradiction as real, they usually elect to throw their faith overboard rather than their politics. This election they not seldom carry out openly, but more often covertly and gradually, giving up first their faith in plenary inspiration, then in the Mosaic inspiration, at last in the Bible itself, and employing progressive forms of exegetical jugglery to ease themselves down from the lower position to the lowest. Perhaps the most melancholy and notorious of such election is that seen in the great American divine and expositor, who has done more than any other Presbyterian to spread the humanitarian theology through the bulk of his denomination, whose doctrine indeed, overflowing the earlier and safer teachings of the senior Alexander and Hodge, have covered them out of sight in the present current of religious thought. This great man declares deliberately and solemnly in his published works, that were he shut up to the alternative between accepting the sense of Scripture

so obvious to the old interpreters, which recognizes domestic servitude as a relation which may be lawful under suitable conditions, or of surrendering his political opinions on that subject, he should throw away his Bible in order to retain those opinions; and he solemnly warns that class of expositors represented by Drs. Hodge, Thornwell and N. L. Rice, that they had better stop their efforts to substantiate that exposition of Scripture, because if they succeeded the only effect would be, not to defend old institutions, but to drive all right-minded christians like himself into infidelity. Let the reader look also at the case of Bishop Colenso, who, when he had expended the whole learning and labor of his latter years in attacking the inspiration of the Old Testament, which in his ordination vows he had sworn to defend, expressly accounted for and justified his course by the fact that he had adopted the new humanitarian politics. The reader may see a more flagrant instance nearer home. Ingersoll, the son of an Old School Presbyterian minister, glories in trampling his father's Bible in the mire of foulest abuse. He tells the public that his abolitionism is a prime moving cause with him to spurn christianity.

Such is the outlook. On the other side, adverse circumstances virtually paralyze all the human powers which should be arrayed in defense of the Bible. Doubtless, many divines remain in the countries and communions infected who see the truth and believe it. They are called conservative, and wish to be considered so. But the only element of conservatism which they call into action at this critical juncture is caution, a caution which prevents their jeopardizing their own quiet and prosperity by coming to the front and meeting the insolent aggression of the new opinions. They dissent, but practically they acquiesce. They commit the same mistake in tactics which General Charles Lee committed one hundred and ten years ago at the battle of Monmouth, and which he himself expressed so pungently in his impertinent reply to his commanding general. When Washington met him retiring instead of attacking, as he had been ordered, he asked him, with stern dignity: "General Lee, what does this mean?" To which the witty Englishman replied: "I suppose it means that I am imbued with rather too much of that rascally virtue caution, in which

your excellency is known to excel." Washington was cautious, but he knew when to be cautious and when overcaution became the most fearful rashness and vigorous audacity the only true prudence. There seems no encouragement to expect that these more enlightened friends of Scripture inspiration will employ the Washingtonian tactics in the impending conflicts. History teaches us that thus far in its preliminary stages, while still possessed of the superior weight of character, position, and even numbers, they have in every instance so misplaced their caution as to give the victory to which they were entitled to the insolent and aggressive minority. How will such men act now that that minority has become a majority flushed with triumph?

Thus circumstances make it, humanly speaking, certain that there is but one small quarter of Protestant christendom from which frank opposition to the new opinions is to be expected. The current sweeps too strongly, the error is too popular. Such determined opposition as would be adequate to stem it would be too inconvenient. Now the circumstance which is so untoward for the cause of truth is this, that the conquering section in America, in order to carry out its purposes, found it desirable to load that obscure district of christendom with mountains of obloquy, heaped on it with a systematic and gigantic diligence for more than a generation, and they have succeeded to their heart's content in making that district odious and contemptible throughout the Protestant world. Thus, whatever of hard-earned experience, whatever of true insight, whatever of faithful and generous zeal the good men of that section may desire to bring to the defense of the common christianity, the world is determined beforehand to reject. "Can any good come out of Nazareth?" The world has been told, that of course warnings and declarations coming from that quarter have a perverse source. This will be believed. All that the enemies of the Bible need do to neutralize our honest efforts in the great defense will be to cry, "Oh, those are the extravagances of a sour pessimist!!" or, "These are but the grumblings of defeated malice and spite against the righteous conquerors!!" Now, that an individual servant of God and truth should be subjected to such taunts is of exceedingly little moment. The momen-

tous result against the interest of the truth is, that the only part of the king's army which is in condition to do staunch battle for his truth is to be discounted in the tug of war. Thus the enemy of the truth has adroitly succeeded in so arranging, beforehand, the conditions of the campaign as to neutralize the powers of resistance, and, humanly speaking, to insure the victory for himself, because the professed friends of the truth will be crushed for want of that sturdy assistance which they themselves had previously disabled by slanders, prompted by their own interested purposes. There will be seen in the result the grimmiest "poetic justice" of divine providence. But the Lord still has faithful servants, and the truth still has steadfast witnesses, who will recognize no duty as superior to that of maintaining Christ's testimony against all odds.

The facts just stated show that the struggle cannot but be long and arduous. The friends of truth must therefore "with good advice make war." While never shirking ecclesiastical discussion when the aggressiveness of error challenges them to it, their chief reliance for victory must be upon the faithful preaching of the old-fashioned gospel and upon godly living. Like the martyr church of Revelation they must "conquer by the blood of the Lamb and by the testimony of Jesus, and by not loving their lives unto the death." Divisions in the ranks of the defenders of the truth, professedly united up to a recent date, are a discouraging sign; but the general decline in the standard of christian living which these have imbibed as an infection from the rationalistic side is a far more ominous sign; "the battle is the Lord's, not man's." He will not deem it worth his while to work a victory for the sake of a mere dead ecclesiastical orthodoxy, which is to be as barren of the fruits of holy living as the code of its assailants. If the communions which profess to stand up for the integrity of Scripture have the nerve to resume strict church discipline, to enforce on their professed members a strict separation from the world, and thus to present to it a christian life beautiful and awful for its purity as of old, they will conquer. If they lack this nerve and shirk this purification of themselves, they will be defeated; they will also be corrupted; and after a deceitful season of bustle and

pretended christian progress, having the form of godliness but denying the power thereof, a wide and long eclipse will come over Protestant christendom, the righteous judgment of a holy God. His true people, perhaps for dreary generations, will be his despised and scattered ones mourning in secret places; and when his times of revival shall return again he will raise up new instruments of his own.

The friends of truth must contend in the spirit of humility. "God resisteth the proud, but giveth strength unto the lowly." They will, of course, recognize themselves as still possessed of the honorable trust, God's truth; they must, of course, believe those who assail them as less honored with this noble trust than themselves; for else what cause have they to contend? But they must always remember the apostle's word, "What have ye that ye did not receive? Now then, why do ye glory in it as though ye had not received it?" If we really have this loyalty to Scripture and to him who gave it, it is of grace. It is God's inworking, not our personal credit. Had he not wrought it in us, "the natural mind," which is just as native to us as to the other sons of Adam, would doubtless be prompting us, like other rationalists, to treat the old gospel claims as "foolishness." And there is a special reason for such christian modesty in the case of Southern christians. The fact that we are now standing on the side of Christ is due in part to a train of secular circumstances with reference to which we had no free agency, and therefore no personal credit. Providence ordained that the modern rationalism should select as its concrete object of attack our form of society and our rights. God thus shut us up to the study and clear apprehension of the religious issue, and decided the side we should take in the contest. But on the other hand, the sophism is obtruded at this point which is just as silly and absurd as pride in us would be misplaced. This asserts that our claim of a mission to testify for God's truth against any professed christians is necessarily the sinful vainglory in us. According to this absurdity the purest church on earth could not dare to testify that any other professed communion of christians, even prelatists, papists, Greeks, Socinians, were any less orthodox than themselves. And if these are no less orthodox, what right

has this purest church to contend against any of them? "God resisteth the proud," but we apprehend also that he does not like sham charity and contemptible logical dishonesties.

Since the opinions and practices hostile to the Scriptures are so protean, so subtile, and so widely diffused, there is no chance for a successful defence of the truth except in uncompromising resistance to the beginnings of error; to parley is to be defeated. The steps in the "down grade" progress are gentle, and slide easily one into the other, but the sure end of the descent is none the less fatal. He who yields the first step so complicates his subsequent resistance as to insure his defeat. There is but one safe position for the sacramental host: to stand on the whole Scripture and refuse to concede a single point.

As to the secular and political doctrines which involve the points of assault upon the rule of faith, the church's true position is wholly defensive. She has no secular institutions, good or bad, to advocate as her ecclesiastical mission. That is simply and solely to deliver the whole revealed will of God for man's salvation. She has no spiritual power to make anything sin, or anything duty, which the Bible has not made such. But if she would not walk into the fatal ambuscades of the enemies of Scripture, she must have a clear and exact perception of the extent of this defensive duty. When encroachers usurp spiritual authority to lay upon the consciences of christians any extra-scriptural doctrine, or requirement, they thereby make that encroachment a part of their ecclesiastical code. And they thus make it the right and duty of the friends of truth, in the exercise of their spiritual and ecclesiastical power, to examine and reject such new doctrine claiming to be spiritual and ecclesiastical. The friends of truth are to do this, not in order to encroach upon, but to protect liberty of conscience in God's children. Failing to understand this part of their defensive duty, they betray the cause entrusted to them to the cunning aggression.

It is the fashion to say that the metes and bounds between the kingdoms of Christ and of Cæsar have always been, and must continue to be, very undefined and vague. This I utterly deny. They have, indeed, been constantly overstepped, but this is because

there have always been churchmen greedy of power, worldly-minded and dictatorial. Men demand of us that we shall draw an exact dividing line between the two jurisdictions, defining everywhere the points at which they meet. The demand is preposterous, because the two kingdoms are not spread upon one plane, but occupy different spheres. There is no zig-zag mathematical line to be drawn in such a case; but the clear space separating the two spheres is all the more easy to be seen by honest eyes. It is pretended that there is great room for debate between fair constructions of the famous rule that church synods must handle and determine nothing except what is ecclesiastical. I am sure the wise men who stated it saw no room at all for such debate. I remember that when they selected these words for their rule they had also declared that Holy Scripture was the sufficient and sole statute book of Christ's *ecclesia*. Hence, their rule means plainly that church synods must handle and determine just what Holy Scripture determines, and nothing else; and they must determine what they handle precisely as Scripture does. Is not that distinct enough? Or, if any one seeks further definition, it may be found very simply in this direction. Let us premise first, that whatever is expressly set down in Scripture and whatever follows therefrom by good and necessary consequence, are binding on the christian conscience. Now, all possible human actions must fall in one of these three classes: (1,) Actions which Scripture positively enjoins. (2,) Actions which Scripture positively forbids. (3,) Actions which Scripture leaves indifferent. In the first case, church courts are to enjoin all that God enjoins, and nothing else, and because he enjoins it. In the second case, they are to prohibit what he prohibits, and on the ground of his authority. In the third case, they are to leave the actions of his people free to be determined by each one's own prudence and liberty, and this because *God has left them free*.

R. L. DABNEY.

IV. THE SPIRIT OF PRESBYTERIANISM, AS DEVELOPED IN MODERN HISTORY.

There is nothing so thoroughly misunderstood by the world as the Presbyterian system. The more spiritual the object, the less likely is it to be comprehended by the carnal mind. It may read like a paradox, to affirm that the most efficient factor in modern civilization and the advancement of true liberty has been that ecclesiastical power which was inaugurated by John Knox and his associates, at the beginning of the Reformation, on scriptural principles, and has continued to this day to lead and regulate the conservative progress of social development. The apparent paradox is, however, in our humble judgment, a sound proposition readily demonstrable from history. A denial of its truth would betray the ignorance or the prejudice of the objector.

The younger class of readers especially need to be reminded of certain facts bearing upon this assertion, that are generally lost through the presence of worldly interests and the influence of fascinating literature calculated to warp, rather than inform, the judgment. One of the most efficient causes of the errors and ignorance referred to, has unquestionably been the habit in popular authors of entertaining their readers with caricatures of piety as exhibited in the idiom and conduct of the less cultivated classes. Nor can it be denied that the English Church has exercised a dominant and prejudicial influence in English history. Its position, its wealth, its learned leisure and its overbearing assumptions have given it a disproportionate share in the formation of modern opinion. The Presbyterian body has never been able to compete with such a rival in any field but one—the field of popular education and religious instruction of the masses of the people.

The posture of the Presbyterian Church has been, from the first, one of difficulty and danger. At every juncture, when it has been true to its own principles, it has encountered the hostility of the world. It has stood as a break-water between priest-craft and state-craft, from the days of Knox until now. The confusion of

Scottish history, from the Reformation to the Revolution of 1688, is simply due to this triangular conflict, in which the Kirk sought to maintain its spiritual independence, of the arrogant hierarchy on the one hand, and the unprincipled and sordid aristocracy on the other. Many mistakes were, of course, committed. The spiritual power of the church was often transcended, and she was tempted, on occasion, to employ intrigue or force to frustrate the designs of her enemies. But a candid examination will satisfy any honest inquirer that the end in view was never entirely overlooked, and that this end was, not worldly power, but the establishment of the kingdom of Christ.

The signal mistakes of this church are among the most conclusive proofs of its unworldly spirit. Amid all the conflicts of factions in Scotland, the Kirk continued to contend for the preëminence of the spiritual over the temporal, and yet insisted upon an unbroken allegiance of individuals to the crown, the government and the laws of the country. But general history has utterly failed to record the extent of her sufferings under a succession of tyrants. The moment when King James VI. of Scotland became also James I. of England, was the beginning of a series of trials far exceeding any in the past, throughout an era in which this church was a prime agent, a suffering witness, and a bleeding victim. Third parties are seldom successful until the two principal contestants are exhausted. This was signally illustrated under the Stuarts. The despotism of James I. culminated under Charles I., and the Long Parliament of England was forced into resistance by successive acts of arbitrary power. Civil war began, and the remainder of the Parliament, forsaken by the cavaliers, being opponents of the king, became gradually divided into two parties—the republicans on the one hand, inclining towards independency in religion, and the advocates of a limited monarchy, on the other hand, inclining to a church establishment analogous to that of Scotland. Hence the popular and historical names of these parties became stereotyped in English history as Independents and Presbyterians. Generically they were Parliamentarians in respect to government, and Puritans in reference to their rejection of prelacy.

It is well known that the Scots were allied with the English Parliament during the first stage of the conflict, and that their army of observation was stationed in the north of England until the royal power was overthrown. The king, to escape from the toils of his enemies in England, fled in disguise to the Scottish camp, in the vain hope that the loyalty of the northern kingdom would facilitate his return to power. But the army of Scotland, guided by popular sentiment at home, could not be persuaded to restore him to liberty and the throne without guarantees which Charles would not give. Scotland stipulated for the payment of her forces before they should retire, and when this was done, right or wrong, she surrendered the royal captive to the English commissioners. This act has been laid at the Presbyterian door by prejudiced parties ever since, as one of perfidy and treason. The money has been put in this scale, and the king in that, and the unwarranted conclusion drawn that the one was the price of the other. There is no evidence whatever that this was the case. The king was, however, held and transferred as a prisoner, and the true question relates to the right of the people of either nation to restrain him. All civilized people now agree that a nation is not under moral obligation to submit to a tyrant. Restraint of some kind was the only alternative. The king might have given guarantees, but refused, and he was thus surrendered to the English authorities to be dealt with as events might determine. Right or wrong, the deed was to this extent done, and here the responsibility of Presbyterianism ends. It is responsible for resistance and for restraint of the king, and for steadfast opposition to oppression from church or state; but it is not responsible, as a malicious literature avers, for the unexpected events that followed. The criminality and folly of the republican faction in the English army, in its overthrow of the Parliament, its usurpation of judicial power, and its trial and execution of the king, are all readily admitted; but surely no honest critic can charge these atrocities upon the Presbyterians, who alone stood in the way of their perpetration, and had to be removed by force before such outrages could be accomplished. There is no serpent-poison more concentrated or more noxious than the slander, so generally propagated from

age to age, that the Presbyterians of Scotland and England were implicated, as a body, in that stupendous crime. The whole mass of documentary evidence utters an unbroken testimony to the fact that the Presbyterians of that age, in both countries, were equally averse to prelacy and independency, and no less opposed to republicanism than to an unlimited exercise of royal prerogative.

Had the Presbyterian party been either openly or secretly inclined to the military usurpation that followed the retirement of the Scottish army, it is evident that they would have betrayed some satisfaction at the result. Cromwell's administration was eminently conciliatory, and all parties who quietly submitted enjoyed a toleration in religion which they had no reason to expect. It is strange, but true, that this usurping power, so unscrupulous in matters of state, was centuries in advance of its time in its recognition of the rights of conscience. Milton, in one of his most violent pamphlets, thus speaks in the spirit of the nineteenth century on this most important theme: "The covenant enjoins us to endeavor the extirpation, first of popery and prelacy, then of heresy, schism, and profaneness, and whatsoever shall be found contrary to sound doctrine and the power of godliness; and this we cease not to do by all effectual and proper means. But these divines might know that to extirpate all these things can be no work of the civil sword, but of the spiritual, which is the word of God." This is noble language from Cromwell's secretary, and worthy of a far better cause than that which he was serving under a military dictator whom the people had had no voice in elevating to power. Personally, Cromwell was better than any of the Stuarts, and his administration was milder, purer, and more glorious than theirs, but his title was acquired like the booty of a highway robber, and his legacy to the people was an era of oppression, corruption, and degeneracy. Under the gentle sway of this usurper the most restive parties in all three kingdoms were the Presbyterians. Instead of countenancing violence and enjoying religious indulgence, we find them giving Cromwell more trouble than all others of his subjects, not by seditious conduct and breaches of the peace, but by perpetual and constantly reiterated protest against the whole method of the pending revolution. They were beyond measure

indiscreet, but it was the indiscretion of men who sought to imitate the ancient prophets by denouncing the crimes of the rulers of the land in terms of intense abhorrence. It was the indiscretion of men who could not be enticed by any form of indulgence or flattery to appear, even by silence, to approve of atrocious crime.

That which Presbyterians must ever regard as the greatest aggravation of their cruel treatment by the Stuarts, after the restoration, was the royal ingratitude. It was the Scottish nation, the Presbyterian Protestants of Ireland, and the Long Parliament of England, restored by General Monck, and consisting chiefly of the very men whom Cromwell had expelled on account of their advocacy of a constitutional monarchy and a Presbyterian church, that blindly recalled the king to the throne of his fathers. Let it not be forgotten that Charles II., with a large majority of the prominent actors in all these stages of the restoration, had signed the "SOLEMN LEAGUE AND COVENANT," by which they were sworn to sustain both liberty and order in church and state. And the world should not ignore the fact that the subsequent affliction of the true "Covenanters" was, in the main, the work of republicans and royalists who had been members of the League. The Presbyterians were crushed between two mill-stones, and the men who did the crushing are historically impaled as a generation of perjurers! The Presbyterians were so unworldly and unsuspecting as to rely upon the royal word of the unprincipled king and the honor of the corrupt politicians around him, and, before a year had elapsed, they found themselves writhing under the heels of a coalition of traitors, who were countenanced and sustained in all this cruelty and wickedness by a vindictive hierarchy.

Every age witnesses the occultation of some important truth. It is necessary for some hand to bring it back into the field of vision. This is one of the lost facts of history. The Presbyterians of Great Britain and Ireland were, previous to their emancipation at the Revolution of 1688, *a third party, and an intermediate section of the Reformed Church*, far behind some of the Independents in apprehending the rights of conscience, but far in advance of the Stuarts and their adherents, in appreciating the necessary limits of human authority in civil and religious affairs. They

were the most honest, the most consistent, the most persevering, of all parties or sects, and for these reasons it was their lot to suffer more severely than all others at the hands of despotism, whether hereditary or usurped.

All history may be challenged for a nobler example of christian magnanimity than that exhibited by the great body of Presbyterians in Great Britain and Ireland, when James II. inaugurated his diabolical scheme to overthrow the Protestant Episcopal Church established by law, and reinstate popery in its place. It will be remembered that this royal miscreant, from considerations of mere policy, included Protestant Dissenters in his indulgence, and thus gave them a welcome ease from the oppression of a Protestant government and hierarchy. But whilst they rejoiced in a sense of relief, they were guilty of no unseemly exultation, and cordially united with the Established Church in extending to the Prince of Orange a warm and loyal reception. The occasion was obviously presented for a display of a spirit of triumph, when they saw their late persecutors yielding up ignominiously their places of power and wealth for the benefit of their Romish successors. But the conduct of the Presbyterians generally at that crisis was marked by a noble dignity and disinterestedness, and stands out in glorious contrast with that of the hierarchy. There was no vindictive triumph, but we find them heartily coöperating with the bishops and clergy in rescuing the established churches of England and Ireland from the toils of popery, and contenting themselves with establishment in Scotland alone. William III. was governed as much by policy as by piety in reference to ecclesiastical affairs; but he had been trained in the school of Dutch Presbyterianism, and although an Erastian, was far more enlightened and liberal than any preceding king. To him and the wise councillors around him is undoubtedly due, under providence, that general abandonment of persecution which has marked most subsequent administrations under the British crown, and the diffusion of more enlightened views of religious liberty, not only in those islands, but in every part of the world where Protestant civilization prevails. And especially do we see the fruit of this great revolution of human thought in these western commonwealths, where the rights of

conscience are guaranteed in all our fundamental laws. History proves that, in every crisis, the English hierarchy has resisted to the utmost every advance towards this blessed result, whilst the Presbyterians have generally been found arrayed in support and defense of measures tending to a more enlarged liberty in church and state. They have sometimes erred in excessive enthusiasm for their principles, and thus incurred the reproach of fanaticism. Their oppressors, on the other hand, have erred in excessive devotion to power and place, and heartless indifference to the conscientious scruples of Dissenters. The difference lay between an exaggeration of right principle by one party, and a want of it in the other.

This statement would appear harsh but for notorious facts. It is signally illustrated in the events that occurred in Ireland after the advent of William of Orange to England. The Presbyterians of Ulster had not bound themselves to James II. by solemn oath of supremacy, but only accepted his deceitful indulgence to papists and themselves. They could therefore consistently make common cause with the Established Church in welcoming the new king. They flew to arms, and, by their heroic defense of Londonderry and Enniskillen, contributed their full share to the success of the revolution. Their representatives visited the prince in England at the beginning with open congratulations, and their ministers did not hesitate to pray in his behalf. They were conspicuous as rebels, and did not show any shame for their intelligent choice.

How was it with the Irish hierarchy? History informs us that, a few months before the battle of the Boyne, several of the Episcopal clergy of Dublin and its vicinity had appeared before King James with an address of loyalty to him, and the same persons visited King William in his camp after the battle with a similar address to the latter. The addresses are extant, and are said to be of about equal fervor towards the two rivals. All this was from a body of clergy who had subscribed "that it was not lawful, upon any pretense whatever, to take arms against the king." This declaration plainly condemns the Prince of Orange and all his Protestant followers who had been in arms at the date of the first ad-

dress, and requires the logic of a Jesuit to reconcile either address with christian morals.

The contrast on this and a number of subsequent occasions between the two parties, is such that every generous and upright heart must recognize it. It is a shame to withhold due credit from the suffering party, and to use national history for the purpose of justifying a system of ecclesiastical policy chargeable with so many enormities as was the English hierarchy. This is even now constantly done both in England and the United States. Those who enjoy literary leisure, and are not engrossed by works of righteousness, are too apt to incline to the dominant party, and to pay an undue homage to the mitred class, who have figured so long in British aristocracy and exhibited a conspicuous disdain towards the humble clergy of another style, who have been far more faithful and earnest in behalf of the civil and religious rights of mankind. This we say, however, with thankful recognition of the services rendered to the same cause by a large number of churchmen. The criticism applies to none in our day whose consciences and tastes recoil from the abuses of the past.

The great fact which we seek to present intelligibly and impressively to the reader is the comparative *purity of the Presbyterian denomination from the Erastian and secular errors of some other bodies of christians*. Among the evils attending a church establishment, there is none more corrupting than that of *patronage*—an abuse happily unknown to American Protestants. The more spiritual part of the Presbyterian churches in Great Britain and Ireland had been sorely tried, under the Stuarts, by bitter persecution; and under William III. and Anne, to the moment of union between England and Scotland, they had suffered intensely from a different cause. The policy of these sovereigns, however tolerant towards dissenters, was in the highest degree unfavorable to the spiritual independence of the two established churches. The Church of England basked and rejoiced in the sunshine of royal favor, whilst the Presbyterians of Scotland were compelled by their principles to protest, on many occasions, against the restrictive measures of the government. But through the wise moderation of King William, they had secured one great measure

of reform which promised the richest spiritual results. Patronage had been completely abolished, and the people of each parish rightfully invested with the choice of their pastors. It seems incredible in this age that such a system as that of patronage could have endured so long among a christian people with Bibles in their hands. The right of presentation to a multitude of benefices, even in the Presbyterian Church, had been enjoyed for generations by a great variety of secular persons and corporations, and the congregations were deprived of their inherent privileges as subjects of the kingdom of Christ. At the time of the union, in 1707, the Kirk of Scotland was happily rescued from this prolific source of heresy and corruption. Lay patrons could no longer fill the pulpits of Scotland with men of questionable faith and character, and it was at least possible for the church to advance in spiritual improvement. This was the actual status when the union was consummated, which embraced a solemn covenant, securing to the Kirk its rights and privileges. It is painful to record the fact that, in open violation of this sacred covenant, the united Parliament in 1712 rapidly, ruthlessly and infamously passed an act restoring this abominable abuse in the Scottish establishment, in spite and contempt of the opposition of the Scottish people. A blacker crime has rarely stained the legislation of a civilized government. The reader may perhaps inquire how such an act could be perpetrated. The question is easily answered. Many unprincipled men had been introduced into the Kirk by the lay patrons under the Stuarts. King William consented to the abolition of patronage, but insisted upon retaining in the establishment a considerable number of prelatists and Jacobites who were the undoubted enemies of both himself and the church. This was in pursuance of his fixed policy of toleration. He conceived that his throne would be strengthened by endeavoring to conciliate all classes of dissenters, and therefore exacted of the Presbyterians of Scotland, who were his most cordial supporters, a reluctant consent to retain such of these incumbents of parishes as maintained a decent deportment. A considerable party in the church was therefore already organized in 1712 in support of the treacherous proposition to restore the law of patronage.

But it still remains difficult to understand how a British Parliament could be induced to perpetrate an act so cruel, unjust and impious. All presumption would, as a matter of course, be against it. History, however, records many things which reason would pronounce incredible. It declares that this same British Parliament did not hesitate afterwards to tax the American colonies without their representation or consent, and for eight long years to seek to impose a tyrannical yoke upon millions of the sons of Britain as well entitled to freedom as themselves. It declares that in our own day that enlightened body has had the meanness to sanction the act of its government compelling the Chinese empire to admit into its ports a product of its Indian dependency which that empire desired to exclude as pernicious and fatal to the well-being of its subjects. The black catalogue of similar outrages upon human rights might be prolonged to weariness. But let it suffice to affirm, summarily, that not only the British Parliament, but the American Congress, has, on some occasions, knowingly and brutally trampled upon the rights of weaker parties which the law of God had forbidden to be touched.

It should be remembered that the union had exerted a pernicious influence upon the nobility and the politicians of Scotland. Both classes had become Anglicanized by the change of capital from Edinburgh to London. A more courtly and compliant form of religion readily commended itself to the wealthy and titled attendants upon the worship of the metropolis, and from that day to this the aristocracy of Scotland has followed that of England in preferring the ecclesiastical system of the latter. Worldly considerations of one kind have influenced the peerage, and still other motives have warped the views of the politicians. The latter class of public men easily discovered that the English Church was far less obstructive and much more manageable than the Scottish Kirk. It need not, therefore, occasion any great surprise that even as early as 1712 the British Parliament was ready to destroy so sacred a provision of the act of union as the law against lay patronage. A legislature strongly biased in both houses against the Presbyterian Church, and notoriously corrupted by the vices of the times, was ripe enough for an act of perfidy, and needed only a favorable occasion to commit it.

The result of this shameful restoration of a most abominable abuse was to introduce again into the Church of Scotland a growing element of a character more remarkable for worldly culture than for religious principle. Moderatism, the euphemistic designation of spiritual laxity or indifference, acquired a predominance in the establishment which long continued to bring forth its characteristic fruit in rationalism and intolerance. Not until our own day did the reviving spirit of evangelical piety begin with effect to assert itself in the councils of that church.

No more dramatic scene, or one more forcibly illustrating the true spirit of Presbyterianism, ever appeared in the annals of modern christianity than that of 1843 in the streets of Edinburgh. For several years past a series of painful collisions had occurred between patrons and congregations in different parts of Scotland, leading to violent agitation in church and state, and attended with unbounded excitement and disorder of the public mind. It is not difficult, however, to state the one principle in which the strife originated. The laws of the Church of Scotland required a call to be made out by the heritors, elders, heads of families, and parishioners of a parish, and forbade that any pastor *should be intruded on any congregation contrary to the will of the people*. These laws were professedly founded on spiritual principles and scriptural authority. They could not be repealed or neglected without unfaithfulness to Christ, the supreme head of the church. The law of patronage, reimposed upon the church by the state, in obvious violation of the terms of union, was regarded by the former as valid only in reference to temporalities. The moderate party, however, predominated in some Presbyteries, and these proceeded on several occasions to induct the nominees of patrons, on the call of small minorities of the people, in spite of their protest. The Synods and Assemblies deciding such cases on appeal in favor of the people, the intruding parties brought their claims before the civil courts, and they ultimately reached the House of Lords. These courts decided the question against the church, as might have been expected, and the shameful scene was several times witnessed by the free Presbyterian people of Scotland, in the memory of many now living, of mercenary ministers being forced upon

unwilling congregations by a demonstration of arms. In the Assembly of 1843 a majority of the God-fearing members of the body, finding all hope of fair dealing from the civil power utterly lost, seceded with dignity from the establishment, and constituted the Free Church of Scotland. This grand event forms an era in the history of the modern church. The self-sacrifice of the Free Church was the salvation of Presbyterianism in Scotland, and led to an early repeal of the odious law of patronage.

We have referred to it for the purpose of developing with historical distinctness the leading feature of a system of church polity which now, with more emphasis than ever, asserts among us its divine origin. We mean nothing less than this, that in all its history in Scotland, England, Ireland, and the United States, Presbyterianism, consistently held, has refused to acknowledge loyalty in spiritual matters to any sovereign but Jesus Christ, and has chosen rather to suffer than to submit to the dictation of the state. In reference to civil questions, its principles are unchangeably settled in the Westminster Confession of Faith, in which it is declared that "Synods and councils are not to intermeddle with the civil affairs which concern the commonwealth," except for certain specified purposes clearly within their jurisdiction. And it is no less distinctly affirmed, that no party in the state shall interfere with the spiritual functions of the church, of which Jesus Christ alone is the living head. It was for these unalterable principles that the immortal band of ministers and elders, members of the Scottish General Assembly of 1843, in solemn procession abandoned the Establishment, with all its properties, dignities, and revenues, and to secure spiritual liberty renounced all further connection with the British government.

The Presbyterians of Great Britain were backward, it is true, in surrendering a claim to support from the state. The Independents were far in advance of them as advocates of absolute separation, for the obvious reason that they never had enjoyed the advantages of an Establishment. But we insist upon the historical proposition, that the Presbyterians have ever been in the lead as the fearless and faithful champions of the great principle most distinctly announced by themselves, that the secular and spiritual

spheres in society are altogether diverse in nature and function, and the kingdom of Christ cannot be subordinated to any temporal authority or influence.

With such antecedents, the Presbyterians of the new world were providentially prepared for their conspicuous appointment to direct and mould the free institutions of the United States. Through their commanding influence in the counsels of the founders of the republic, the same great principle for which they had contended and suffered in the old country became engrafted upon the constitutions of the new. The secular power was prohibited to control or contaminate the ark of God with its unhallowed hand, and in consequence, to-day a multitude of christian sects are enjoying a complete independence.

It is the plainest of all corollaries that this independence is mutual. If the church may not meddle with politics, politics ought to be excluded from the church. Under republican institutions the difficulty lies in preventing the intrusion of party feeling into ecclesiastical assemblies. Under such an influence the church may easily be betrayed into action glaringly inconsistent with its own cherished creed. The question of loyalty has often presented itself to Presbyterian councils, and it has been shown that this church has always refused, as a branch of the kingdom of Christ, to acknowledge allegiance to any potentate or commonwealth. It has, however, been often solicited by rival claimants to the crown to determine the allegiance of its members. The reader has been reminded that, *as an established church*, she has decided such questions in a spiritual sense, and with a high regard to the authority of God and the rights of the people. But in the United States the question of loyalty has assumed another aspect, and the conscience has been embarrassed by the conflicting claims, not of *dynasties*, but of *interpretations of the constitution*.

The Presbyterian Church, although established in Scotland by law, refused to sustain the authority of Charles II. and James II., on the ground that neither of them could be trusted without some restraint upon the prerogative. In the United States she was induced by the pressure of *a political party*, at the beginning of our civil war, to decide the allegiance of the citizen, by *assuming* the

correctness of an interpretation of the constitution which had been honestly disputed from the origin of the union. Her posture during the wars of the Stuarts was that of neutrality without compromise, until neutrality was made impossible by the designs of a popish king. But the Presbyterians of the United States failed in our civil conflict to abstain with due consistency from "meddling" with the question of *primary allegiance*, on which the founders of the government themselves differed in opinion, and violated their own principles by deciding in favor of one of the contesting parties. In other words, they assumed the principle so long repudiated, that an Assembly *may* "meddle with civil affairs that concern the commonwealth" in the most vital point, which is the allegiance of the citizen.

The Southern Presbyterian Church owes its existence to this unfortunate assumption of a power of interpretation which even the Supreme Court of the United States had never directly exercised. During the war, and after the peace, this body of Christians remained separate from the mother church in painful antagonism. Time softened the asperities of a bloody strife, and at length, with the view of restoring fraternal relations, the Southern Assembly adopted for itself, and proffered to the other Assembly, a mutual retraction of all offensive expressions, without demanding the abandonment of any principle. The Assembly at Springfield, Illinois, instead of an unreserved adoption of the resolution as sent, appended to it a declaration that the political action of preceding Assemblies was not included.

From that day, the status of the two bodies has continued friendly, but apart. But it is now proposed by certain brethren in our own church to take another step, and in some way consolidate the two bodies. To this many others object, and we reiterate the objection, that the Northern Church declines to "recede" from her erroneous principle, affirmed in repeated action, to the purport that synods and councils may, under political pressure, determine for the members of the church to what civil government their loyalty primarily belongs! This claim of jurisdiction is, in our judgment, a gross departure from the true historical position of the church, and an insuperable bar to organic union.

Absolute consistency is not to be expected in any ecclesiastical body. The Southern branch of the American Presbyterian Church has not claimed a faultless record. But, in the matter of *principle* adopted and generally acted upon, she claims to represent the historical church of our fathers in a strict interpretation of the Confession, and a complete separation from secular governments and political parties.

Presbyterianism has the honor of literally fulfilling the Scriptures in its past experience: "Ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake." Arbitrary sovereigns have ever found it an obstruction to their selfish designs. Corrupt politicians have long learned that it could not easily be flattered or intimidated. A frivolous world has denounced it as sour and repulsive, and some of its sister denominations have striven hard to banish it from Christendom. In spite of opposition, jealousy, and defection, it has made a wonderful progress in the van of civilization, and especially here in the western hemisphere its mission is obvious—to serve as a prime factor in the recovery of the world from sin and death. The defense and diffusion of the truth as it is in Jesus is its proper aim, and this result depends, under God, upon our fidelity to the principles of our fathers, so carefully derived from the Scriptures undiluted by tradition. Among these principles there is none more distinctly peculiar to the Presbyterian Church than this pronounced unworldliness, which has marked its entire history, involved it in unspeakable troubles, and constituted both its weakness and its strength.

We assume as indisputable that the life of our Lord is the safest policy of his people. The church must stand related to "the powers that be" precisely as he stood. "The children are free," as he himself declares, and compliance with the demands of the civil power is conceded only to avoid offense. (Mat. xvii. 27.) It follows necessarily that the christian church is bound by its allegiance to Christ to preserve, as far as possible, a meek and charitable independence, and avoid with the utmost care all suspicion of subserviency to the policy of the world. The members of an ecclesiastical body may, of course, exercise all their rights as citizens in political associations, but in church courts the para-

mount dignity and sovereignty of Christ cannot be surrendered.

Whatever inconsistencies may be discovered in the records of various Presbyterian councils, one thing is clear beyond dispute, that the adjudication of questions of loyalty cannot be a function of a church not connected with the state. And no amount of party zeal can justify the church in any of its branches in exercising an authority never conveyed to her, by precept or example, from her divine head. The time has come for all Presbyterian bodies at least to unite in condemning, *as contrary to our principles*, all interference with the political views of their members.

It is claimed, in defense of the action of the Northern Church, that it was justifiable, on the ground that disloyalty to the Union had a *moral* aspect. It was, they say, morally wrong to sustain secession voluntarily. But that is the question. Was it morally wrong for Englishmen to sustain the Prince of Orange before James II. had abdicated? The best patriots and christians of that day held that they were released from their allegiance by the misconduct of the tyrant, and the Revolution of 1688 settled the principle that the people who have set up a dynasty may take it down, if, in their judgment, the implied covenant has been violated. Now the people of each state, by their suffrages, set up the Union over its territory as the "supreme law" on these same conditions, and they were to be the judges, otherwise their condition would be worse than before. The people of the seceding States may have erred, but all men now know they were conscientious, and no moral question existed to justify censure from the church. It was indeed a change of dynasty by popular vote, within the bounds of each State, on the ground of forfeiture; and the church could not denounce it as immoral without imputing a mystical sanctity to the Union similar to that claimed for the Stuarts by the non-jurors of England. Two questions were before the mind of the citizen: 1, A *political* one, whether the Union had forfeited its claim to allegiance; 2, A *moral* one, whether disunion was justifiable. No church had a right to determine the former, and the latter settled itself as soon as the political fact was ascertained. The moral

question could not arise in the Assembly without first "handling" the political one. It is undeniable that the Assemblies reflected the political opinions of their constituents, and would not have voted secession a crime if they had not before voted for the exclusion of slavery from the common territories by civil law.

The facts by which we must be guided in reference to *organic union* are, therefore, briefly these: The understanding reached by the two churches in 1882 resulted, as was designed, in "fraternal relations." That very act, by its terms, reserving to each body *its distinctive principles*, erected a bar to fusion which has never been removed. It is a principle with the brethren of the Northern Church that the Hamiltonian theory of the Federal constitution was the true one, and the Union indissoluble so long as the stronger section may choose to maintain it, whatever may be the fate of the weaker. From this position, and its moral corollary, they will never recede. But organic union, whenever accomplished, must make that principle *ours*, notwithstanding the impossibility of reconciling it with the Confession of Faith or the fundamentals of civil and religious liberty.

Finally, there is *no necessity* for fusion arising from political conditions. We have no connection with the civil government, and there is no call for an American Presbyterian Church in which our own distinctive principles must inevitably be lost in the overwhelming majority of those who reject them. We have seen no affirmative argument for organic union of any weight whatever, except that very political reason which we repudiate, that *a restored union demands a restored church*. We utterly reject the suggestion. Fraternity has been restored, and that ought to suffice. The fact that the Union has been consolidated by the sword is no reason for the amalgamation of the churches. Coercion has no part in the construction of ecclesiastical bodies. But, if both force and obligation are wanting in the premises, we may urge with confidence against the proposed fusion the gulf that lies between the two bodies in reference to the political scope of church authority and the unsettled question of the social fusion of races. The mere verbal adoption of one creed cannot bridge that gulf, for the obvious reason that an unrestrained majority may at any time

assume that a "moral question" has arisen sufficient to justify the most revolutionary political action. The prayer of our Lord that his people might be one, relates to a union of a spiritual character, and cannot be fulfilled by any visible union whatever, either universal, or continental, or local. It is not a fusion on paper, but a fusion of hearts. It does not look to the national organization, but to universal brotherhood.

J. A. WADDELL.

V. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF HEBREW POETRY.

It is a striking fact, not duly considered, that one half the Old Testament is in poetical form. This alone would render the subject of our paper worthy of careful study, whether the Bible be viewed as a revelation from God or as literature. The study of the Scriptures as literature seems to many a profaning of what is sacred, perhaps because this is often the result and sometimes the purpose of such study. But there is no necessary conflict between the two methods. And the study of the Bible as a literature, if candidly pursued, will increase our interest in it, our admiration for its beauties, and our reverence for its divine character.

Hebrew poetry carries in itself its power to impress. But this impression will be deeper, will better convey the idea of beauty, the more we study sacred literature and compare it with other writings. The force of a steam hammer makes a deep impression on a piece of metal; the same force applied to a die in the mint will produce a coin of great and enduring beauty. And so the force of divine power may convince any mind of the truths of revelation; but the well furnished mind will be impressed also with the beauty of the form worthy of the divine truth conveyed in it.

Let us begin our inquiry by seeking to ascertain the characteristics of all true poetry. And this is no easy task. Perhaps the spirit of Hebrew poetry can in no way be better realized than by comparison with that of our own tongue. The popular standard for poetry is not very high. Its sentiments must coincide with those of its readers; it must rhyme; and the lyrical quality necessary is that it may be sung to some familiar tune. Our hymnals offer abundance of this sort. And as worship demands sentiment before poetry, such compositions call for no remark except that their lack of poetical feeling will probably render them short-lived.

But passing this grade, let us seek the characteristics of poetry as tested by the works of standard English poets.

There is a class, happily small, much of whose poetry consists

of sensual thoughts clothed in impressive measure, elegant diction and noble form, too often like a Babylonish garment about a dead man's bones, or like the beautiful colors that gather about the miasmatic waters of a cesspool or marsh, the more beautiful the more noxious.

A larger class present, in equally attractive garb, happy thoughts and bright, sometimes noble, ideas. Of much of this the attractiveness is in the exquisite finish of the literary style, the perfect rhythm, the graceful flow of language, wholly satisfying the most cultivated taste. Lord Tennyson is perhaps the best example of this. Among these there is of course a great variety. Obscurity seems to be a chief aim of some—and Tennyson set the fashion in this too—so that by some of his imitators, to be obscure and to be poetical in thought, seem to be taken for synonymous terms. Others, like Longfellow, give expression to the lovely and the beautiful in the ordinary experience of the heart. Others again give voice to the profound teachings of nature, whether in its majestic aspects, as Coleridge in his "Hymn before Sunrise in the Vale of Chamouni," or in its homely, as in the best work of Burns. Shakespeare is the myriad-minded, presenting every aspect of the emotions, but rarely striking the deepest chords of the human heart. Milton, the boldest of all, ventures upon themes of profoundest depth, not only to justify the ways of God to man, but to soar on eagle's pinion toward the inaccessible light of divine majesty.

What, then, is poetry? Even this hasty glance may show how difficult it is to define. Certainly we may say that the dress has much to do with it. But as dress does not make the man, neither does rhyme, nor rhythm, nor poetical language, however perfect or charming, constitute the essence of poetry. Noble thought, profound ideas, elevating truth, is the highest element of true poetry. Poetic art has a higher end than to gratify the dilettante, to amuse the idle hour, to minister to the lower nature of man, however refined. This, at least, is not the spirit of Hebrew poetry.

Poetry is in some sort a reflection of the sentiments of the age in which it is written. The monk in the middle ages, Bernard,

thought special divine grace was necessary, and was bestowed upon him, that he might express his pious sentiments in leonine rhyme. And we need not hesitate to recognize a certain fascination in his art, as we read—

Hora novissima, tempora pessima sunt: vigilemus!

Ecce! minaciter, imminet arbiter, ille supremus!

as translated by Rev. S. W. Duffield:

These are the latter times, these are not better times:

let us stand waiting.

Lo! how with awfulness, He, first in lawfulness,
comes arbitrating.

The eighteenth century was not superstitious, but was yet bound by the idea that in the art of poetry the art is more than the poetry. Compare for impressiveness Pope's "Messiah" with Isaiah xi. 1-10 and lx., or "The Universal Prayer" with Psalm xc., and see how the grandeur of Hebrew poetry is weakened by the artifice of English verse.

Our age reflects its broad and varied culture in its literature; but it is a period distinguished by its critical spirit rather than by its pleasure in profound thought; breadth rather than depth, refinement rather than force, characterizes its poetry. From the extreme of refinement we see a rebound to the opposite in Walt Whitman, whose lawlessness is quite in keeping with an impulse felt powerfully in this age. But in his best work the freedom from art is refreshing as a breeze from the mountains in an overheated atmosphere.

In determining the elements of poetry, we must therefore distinguish between what is accidental and what is essential. And if poetry, true poetry at its best, is noble, elevating, stirring thought, expressed rhythmically, and in impressive form, aided by beautiful imagery, and clothed in the most magnificent diction, then we may challenge the comparison of the best of all ages with Hebrew poetry as a whole.

Two great characteristics of the Hebrew people strike every reader of sacred literature. They were profoundly religious, and their temperament was poetic to a rare degree. The Book of Psalms alone would exalt them above every other people for the

expression of the religious sentiment in poetic form. The Book of Job is a monument of profound thought on the gravest subjects cast in the form of dramatic poetry. The Song of Songs is an exquisite epithalamium, still more suggestive of the drama.

It may be thought that the poems named, including most of the Psalms, appeared at the same epoch. The period of David and Solomon, like that of Augustus in Rome, and of Elizabeth in England, seems, like the blooming of the century plant, to be the flowering of the nation in literary expression, the consummate result of centuries of preparation. But though this be true, though it be conceded that Hebrew literature found its highest development in this period, yet the poetic genius of the race shines brightly throughout all its history, in patriarch and prophet, king and peasant, learned and unlearned. Isaiah, whose poetry is surpassingly sublime, was a courtly prophet. Amos, of a humble walk in life like Burns, was a herdsman, a dresser of sycamore trees, no prophet nor a prophet's son,¹ and yet a writer of lofty poetic prophecy.

Nor is it easy to assign the palm of merit to any age. The Blessing of Jacob, the four poems of Moses, the Song of Deborah, the Book of Psalms, the long line of prophets, most of whose burdens were poetical, the Magnificat of Mary, from first to last present instances of the highest poetic merit.

How can we account for this long line of poets stretching over seventeen centuries? Is it a predilection of the race for poetry? or is it inspiration? They were inspired, but does that imply the gift of poetic utterance? Divine truth may be conveyed by the baldest prose, by rhyme as repellent as Rouse's version; may be cast in a form as unadorned in style as the Westminster Confession. Professor Briggs pronounces the story of creation a poem as to its form; and it certainly has high claims to be so considered, but it is usually taken with narrative Scripture generally to be plain prose, though inspired.

Our Saviour's words are the very jewels of inspiration; but though tinged in some parts with a poetic glow characteristic of his ancestral race,² they are yet as a whole prose. And so with the New Testament Scriptures generally. Inspiration, therefore,

¹ Amos vii. 14.

² Matt. v. 1-12; vi. 14-34; vii. 7-20.

does not necessarily imply the gift of poetic form. What, then, is the relation between them? Was the poetic form in which half the elder Scriptures was written due to the poetic temperament of the people of Israel? or was that temperament due to the fact that their writers were the channel of divine revelation?

We may observe that the line between prose and poetry is naturally a vanishing line. As prose becomes lofty in expression, energetic and solemn, it naturally takes on rythnical form. This is more familiar to us perhaps from instances in the New Testament, which being more isolated are more conspicuous.¹ In the Old Testament the transition is so frequent that we scarcely mark the dividing line between them.

Poetry addresses the heart. Landor expressed it finely when he said: "That which moves the heart most is the best poetry; it comes nearest unto God, the source of all power." And there is a relation between metrical form and deep feeling of the heart not easily explained. The feelings move with a cadence like the beats of the heart in our bodies. Emotion is expressed in successive throbs of feeling. The power of music to move is because of this relation. This being common to all men, sympathy intensifies whatever is heard. Many of these psalms were sung in public, and much of the prophecy spoken in public. The rythmic flow falling upon many ears at once evokes sympathy and deepens the effect produced.

Here is the connexion between revelation and the natural expression of it in poetry. Inspired truth was designed to arouse the emotions, and thereby influence the will. The heart of man is like a many-stringed harp, and when its various chords are struck, when it is moved to its depths, and its feelings aroused by the message given, it is natural that its expression should be rythmical. And therefore we find Paul of logical mind, when his whole soul is aglow with the divine fire, break out into the lyrical utterance of the eighth of Romans and the thirteenth of First Corinthians, and elsewhere in briefer passages. Thus we find the awful revelation of eternal wrath falling from the lips of our Saviour in

¹ Rev. iv. 8, 11; v. 9, 10, 12, 13; xiv. 13; xv. 3, 4; xxi. 10, 22, 27; 1 Tim. iii. 16.

the rythmical utterance, thrice repeated, like a refrain, or an echo of woe.¹

In harmony with this idea we find the most poetic parts of Old Testament Scripture to be those where the revelation has most stirred the prophet or psalmist. It was in revealing the future of his posterity and in transmitting the wondrous promise given to his fathers that the Blessing of Jacob was pronounced. When Moses would leave a farewell utterance to touch the hearts of the people whom he loved so profoundly, with a solemn warning never to be repeated, he spake the words of his Song. And at some time, we know not when, perhaps after the awful judgment of Jehovah was announced, cutting off all adult Israelites from the promised land for their lack of faith, the Prayer of Moses, the man of God, was written, the most sublime in thought of human compositions, contrasting the eternity and power of God with the brief life of man in the ebb and flow of his generations upon earth.

Those parts of Scripture are poetical, therefore, in which the life of the soul toward God is unfolded, and in which God reveals his own character and providential care of his people. Narratives both historical and biographical are usually in prose.

At first thought we might expect to find the New Testament Scriptures in poetic form. And we have noticed the tendency in this direction in the more hortatory and stirring parts, just as we find the loftiest oratory to border on poetry. But the most of the New Testament is narrative. The historic mood does not naturally express itself in poetical form. And farther I may quote here from a most thoughtful book on this subject, Isaac Taylor's work entitled "The Spirit of Hebrew Poetry":

"The limits of a divine conveyance of the things of the spiritual world had already been reached by the choir of the prophets. All that could be taught had been taught to them of old. . . . To give reality to what had been foreshown in shadows; to accomplish what had been predicted; to expound in a higher sense, whatever is universal and eternal in morals; to authenticate anew what might have been called in question—these functions were proper to the ministers of the later dispensation; and the books of the New Testament are the record of this work of completion, in its several kinds." Again: "That next coming Revelation, because it was to demand a hearing from all people, and to invite the submission of the

¹ Mark ix. 44, 46, 48.

reason, lays a foundation in the rigid historic mood, which, though it may admit symbols, rejects poetry."

From the purpose of Hebrew poetry to reveal God to man and the spiritual life of man toward God, it is obvious that the chief point of contrast between it and all other poetry is "its absolute subordination to a far loftier purpose than that which ever animates human genius." This, its universal characteristic, is seen in many of its features.

The entire absence of any consciousness of art results from this. The writer charged with a divine message may be thereby moved to sublime expression; poetic diction may be the natural language of lofty inspiration. But to hold back the message in order to polish the language in which it is to be delivered, to withdraw attention from the matter by the beauty of the manner, would be so incongruous as to destroy respect for the claim of the writer to inspiration. Who can read Tennyson or Dryden or Pope without being impressed first with the art? But what instance is there in Scripture where the writer has seemed conscious of his art? The alphabetic Psalms and Lamentations may be adduced. But this seeming exception is found in a late period when Hebrew poetry is not at its best, in a meditative or didactic species in which the acrostic character was probably intended to aid in memorizing. The exception makes the rule more apparent.

The unity of Hebrew poetry arises from this. And no feature is more remarkable than the similarity in purpose, style and subject-matter of the poetry of a score of writers during a period of seventeen centuries. To realize this, compare Chaucer with Cowper, or Spenser with Tennyson, though these are separated by less than five centuries, and note the change of feeling as well as style.

Another feature distinguishes Hebrew from other poetry, ancient or modern, and arises from the same source. It is the total absence of any use of, or approach toward, fiction. There is no epic and no true drama in sacred Hebrew poetry. Why? Because the necessities of these kinds of poetic composition require deviation from the exact truth. The business of epic poetry is to glorify; its end is commonly the apotheosis of its hero. The business of Scripture is to reveal man not as a hero but as a sinner.

How glorious an opportunity there is in the character of David and other Hebrew heroes for an epic ! how differently they are revealed to us ! The nearest approach to the usual human treatment is in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and there it is faith that is held up for admiration rather than those who exercised it. The Book of Job might be called an epic, but not in the usual manner. Job is an isolated individual, typical of the afflicted and patient believer ; he is not the head of a house like Æneas, nor the hero of a nation like those of the Iliad. What a contrast there is between them !

In this connexion the fact is suggestive that in the Bible generally men's characters are described in plain prose. There is to be no idealizing of men even by poetic usage. As Massillon said, *Dieu seul est grand !* This fact is very striking and is characteristic alike of all Hebrew literature, both prose and poetry. Every reader feels that in the Bible he is in a different atmosphere from that of all other books. There is no uncertainty, no hesitating step, no glorifying the great or powerful, no saints with aureoles about their heads. When the God of truth speaks through holy men, even the style must convey the impression of truthfulness.

Closely allied to this is its directness, simplicity and sincerity. There was no mistaking the purpose and character of the message conveyed. This may seem an incorrect judgment in view of the great difficulty of understanding very much of Hebrew poetry. But most of this difficulty arises, not from the style of the writer, but from errors in transmission ; from words and forms difficult for us to understand because of their infrequent occurrence ; from ellipses easily supplied by hearers then, but not by us from lack of local information. Obscurity arises frequently from the rapid transition in the person of the speaker, and the inexactness of grammatical forms which grew out of the habit of a language governed by needs of speech rather than writing. This abruptness gives great dramatic force, as for example in the second or the twenty-fourth Psalm.

We must remember, too, that the primary meaning was all the poet's hearer was intended to understand ; whereas we scarce give a thought to that, and think chiefly, if not exclusively, of the ful-

filment of Messianic prediction and accomplishment of prophecy, much of which, being yet unfulfilled, is necessarily obscure. Directness there certainly was. Nathan was not more direct when he said, "Thou art the man," than were the prophets generally. And with due allowance for variation in the style of different speakers, and considering the grounds for obscurity to us just mentioned, we may fairly claim for Hebrew poetry generally, and the Psalms in particular, the characteristics of perspicuity and simplicity.

Personification was used more abundantly by the Hebrew than by any other poets. This is a peculiarity of their language. Qualities and relationships in vast variety are expressed, not by an adjective, but by the word *son* or *daughter of* attached to the substantive. Thus in Lam. iii. 13, arrows are called sons of the quiver (see margin).¹ In this the poetic temperament of the people is seen in common speech.² Nations are usually presented in the guise of a female character: "Descend and sit in the dust, O virgin daughter of Babylon;"³ sometimes in the person of their kings (*e. g.*, a most striking instance in Isa. xiv). Inanimate objects⁴ are personified; and qualities, as the wisdom of God in Proverbs viii.⁵ Thus Jeremiah, after an exquisitely poetic description of an invasion of the Philistines, by a sudden transition personifies the sword of Jehovah as representing the justice of God demanding this punishment, and addresses it:

O thou sword of Jehovah, how long will it be ere thou be quiet?
Put up thyself into thy scabbard, rest and be still.

And the sword replies:

How canst thou be quiet, seeing Jehovah hath given it a charge?
Against Ashkelon, and against the seashore, there hath he appointed it."

How this adds to the intensity of expression may be seen in "that tremendous image in Isaiah of Hades extending her throat and opening her insatiable and immeasurable jaws."⁷ (Lowth's Hebrew Poetry, p. 105.) The writings of the apostle John, who

¹ 1 Sam. xx. 31, margin, cf. Matt. xxiii. 15, Eph. ii. 2, Job iii. 3, Heb. Isa. xiv. 12, Deut. xxxii. 14, Heb. Exod. xii. 5, margin.

² Ezek. xxiv. 16, 18.

³ Isa. xlvii. 1.

⁴ Ps. xcvi. 7, 8, lxxvii. 16.

⁵ Ps. lxxxv. 10, 11.

⁶ Jer. xlvii. 6, 7.

⁷ Isa. v. 14.

was more imbued with the ancient feeling than any other New Testament writer, abound in personification. The titles given to Christ, "The Word," "The Vine," "The Light of the World," etc., are instances of this.

Another figure of speech, comparison, is closely associated with this, and both, whether united or separate, add greatly to the beauty and liveliness of the poetry.¹ Thus the King of Assyria is represented as saying:

"My hand hath found as a nest the riches of the peoples;

As one gathereth eggs that are forsaken have I gathered all the earth.

There was none that moved the wing, or that opened the mouth, or chirped."²

Joyousness is another mark of Hebrew poetry. The believer's life then and now is a strange mingling of perplexity and faith, uncertainty and peace; few and evil are our days, and yet we are glad all our days. Do not the minor notes of the strain increase as revelation expands? Perhaps the increasing light thrown upon the blessedness in store for the people of God intensifies the shadows of earth. However we may explain it, the joyousness of the elder book of revelation is a present joy, the joyousness of the later Scriptures is a joy of expectation. Perhaps the believer under the old economy, from lack of clearness as to the future, strove more than we do to realize upon earth the privilege of his inheritance among the people of God. Perhaps because he was more under the influence of the tradition of the paradise that was lost, nearer to him than to us, he expected more confidently its reappearance upon earth. Eve seemed to think that in her Cain she had gotten the promised seed. The faithful Israelite of the Wandering, who was told that the land of promise was

"A land which Jehovah thy God careth for;

The eyes of Jehovah thy God are always upon it

From the beginning of the year even unto the end of the year,"³

may well have expected it to be paradise regained. And certain it is that Israel, under the lead of poetic prophecy, was constantly looking for the Son of David, under whose reign

"The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad,

And the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose."⁴

¹ Isa. xlix. 14, 15; Nah. iii. 12; Job vi. 15-20.

³ Deut. xi. 12.

² Isa. x. 14.

⁴ Isa. xxxv. 1.

Many Psalms (*e. g.*, Ps. xxiii) are evidence that at times certainly this was a present joy. As centuries rolled on and hope was deferred, and the people, whether under prosperity or adversity, grew more and more corrupt, prophecy took on a forward look, and inspiration gave the hope a universal character. The darker grew the present, the brighter grew the prophecy; as faithful followers of Jehovah became fewer, prediction took a wider scope, until at the darkest period of Hebrew history all the earth was included under the sway of Messiah in prophetic writings. This onward look has at last come to be universal among men, not merely among christians, but among unbelievers, nihilists, atheists; not religious hope merely, but political, social, industrial. Whence came it? There was no such feeling in antiquity. Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die, they said. Modern invention, industrial progress, civil liberty, to these some may ascribe it. We believe it is due largely to Hebrew poetic prophecy, whose influence is now universally diffused. This joyousness is seen in many particular odes and lyrics,¹ and is seen also in the constant tendency to burst out into song very noticeable in prophecy,² but observable also in common life as presented in the historical books.³

Hebrew poetry cannot be thoroughly appreciated and enjoyed without familiar knowledge both of the history of the people and the geography of the Holy Land. Palestine has been well called the epitome of all lands. The snow clad summits of Lebanon were there, and the torrid plains of Jericho; the suddenly rising mountain torrent and the everflowing Jordan; the smiling plain like Sharon, clothed most of the year in all the beauty of vegetation and flowers, and the bare and bleak wilderness of Judah, with its caves and rocky fastnesses and yawning chasms; the lake of Galilee, set like a gem in the bosom of the land, and the restless, mighty ocean ever rolling at her feet. Very few spots on the earth's surface present such varied scenery in so small a space. It has been said that no people have ever possessed the gift of a

¹ Ps. xcv., xcvi., xcviii., c. ² Isa. xii., xxxv.; Hab. iii; Ezek. xix., xxxii. 2-16.

³ Gen. xxvii. 27-29, 39, 40; Judg. v.; Num. xxi. 17, 18.

poetic temperament whose native home was in flat alluvial lands.¹ However that may be, Hebrew poetry is full of imagery drawn from the wonderful variety of scenery in its native home; and every people on the face of the earth can find in this land, which Jehovah designed for his people, some aspect of their own land.

Next to the scenery of their land, the most fruitful source of the abundant imagery of Hebrew poetry is found in domestic life. Family and home, herds and flocks, occupations and enjoyments, are constantly drawn upon. But most startling of all in effect and fullest of grandeur are the figures drawn from the marvellous and frequent interpositions of divine power in the nation's history. The wonders of their deliverance from the house of bondage, the pathway made for them through the sea and the Jordan, the awfulness of Sinai at the delivery of the law, the visible sign of God's presence in the shekinah over the tabernacle and temple, are fruitful sources of imagery. The spread of the gospel has carried this knowledge of the history of God's people and of the Holy Land to all nations. "Hence, while Hebrew poetry is intensely national and local, and never ceases to be Hebrew in order to become universal, it is yet universal while it is Hebrew."

Addressed first to a single people, dwelling for centuries apart from the nations in a narrow land, it was intended to be read and understood by all people, and to move their hearts. In order to this end it must be translated into all tongues, ancient and modern, refined and barbarous. If Hebrew poetry had been as artificial as is our own or as that of most cultivated races, its beauty and impressiveness would have disappeared in translation. But as it is marked by majesty of thought, and as its form is the simple rhythm becoming the thought, the result is that in the most prosaic of translations its chief beauty is sure to appear.

But Hebrew poetry is not as wanting in art as the reader of the Authorized Version would suppose. It presents some examples of the development of poetry into set form of various species. It is for the greater part lyrical, and the reasons for the absence of the epic and the drama have been alluded to.

¹ Taylor's Spirit of Hebrew Poetry, p. 67.

The Psalms are so familiar as the book of Hebrew lyrical poetry that the fact is apt to be forgotten that all Hebrew literature is studded with gems of various kinds worthy of being gathered and placed in suitable setting. There are not a few instances of elegiac poetry. The Book of Lamentations has given our language a word, *jeremiad*, descriptive of a kind of elegy.

David's lament over Saul and Jonathan is an exquisite example of perfect finish, though sadly mangled in the A. V. Compare it with Milton's "*Lycidas*" and Tennyson's "*In Memoriam*." It will not yield in beauty to either, and in its sincerity and artlessness, compared with the prolonged and elaborate artificiality of the latter, the characteristics of Hebrew and English poetry are well contrasted. The one is truthful, natural, spontaneous; the others, while beautiful, are so studied as to impress the reader with the art rather than the feeling.

The Hebrew psalter, yielding to the same influences as modern hymnals, presents some examples, notably the 119th Psalm, more remarkable for didactic than poetic qualities, and yet by no means destitute of feeling.

The Book of Proverbs is more perfect in the parallelism, which is the mark of Hebrew poetry as to form, than the other books usually are. But it lacks poetic diction, imagery, and feeling, and its thought is philosophic rather than poetical.

From a union of several of the qualities mentioned arises that characteristic of Hebrew poetry in which it excels all others, its sublimity. A message which is a direct revelation from God, clothed in figurative language whose imagery is at once familiar and majestic, delivered with simplicity and directness, must be sublime. Here Hebrew poetry is matchless. Examples might be multiplied to any extent, and are too familiar to need to be quoted.

The grandest of painters, Michael Angelo, has depicted the Hebrew prophet sitting, wrapped in his mantle, listening, in hushed and reverent awe, to the voice of the oracle. This is the spirit of Hebrew poetry, the mind of man closed to the scenes and sounds of earth, and listening to the still, small voice, the awful utterance of divine revelation, "I will hear what God Jehovah

will speak.”¹ With him the thought is the essential thing. And when the frenzy comes upon him—for this is the Hebrew idea—the prophet is beside himself, the truth he has to utter is not his own, it is given to him,²—then the grandeur of the theme brings with it grand expression, all nature is drawn upon for imagery, and the heart is stirred with the importance of the truth revealed to it.

JOHN H. THOMAS.

LAWRENCEBURG, IND.

¹ Ps. lxxxv. 8.

² Num. xxiv. 3, 4, 15, 16.

VI. NOTES.

DABNEY'S REFUTATION OF THE SENSUALISTIC PHILOSOPHY.—BUT WHAT NEXT?

At the opening of this paper, I cannot refrain from saying how delighted I am that the Southern Presbyterian Church has started an organ having so high an aim as the *PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY*. That church has defended all along the orthodox faith in religion, and now it is pleasant to find that it is setting before it a high moral end in literature and philosophy.

We are pleased to find that Dr. Dabney has been called to issue an enlarged edition of his philosophical work on "The Sensualistic Philosophy of the Nineteenth Century." He says: "The sensualistic philosophy is that theory which resolves all the human spirit into the functions of the five senses and modifications thereof." He begins very properly with Hobbes, who speaks so clearly and dogmatically that weaker people bend under him, as led to believe that he must be speaking truly. Deriving all our ideas from the senses, he strips the soul of all its deeper principles and associations. We can believe that he should have so felt in regard to this world that he desired to find a hole by which he might creep out of it. He next takes up Locke, whom I am accustomed to speak of as "sagacious," but whom Dr. Dabney describes somewhat curiously as "pious and amiable," and as "tender-hearted." We are not sure that he does justice to Locke, who held such sway over the philosophy of our fathers the whole of last century and the beginning of this. Locke, it should be remembered, calls in reflection as well as sensation as a source of ideas, and gives intuition an important, though, we think, not the right place in the mind, had a strong intellectual element, as has been shown by Professors Bowen and Webb, in his philosophy, and was a decided rationalist in religion. We agree with Dr. Dabney that Locke did not give a sufficiently deep foundation to knowledge, and was responsible so far for the sensationalism of France and the nescience of Hume. Dr. Dabney's picture is, "We see a pure and pious Locke, a perspicacious ecclesiastic like Condillac, an aged literary coxcomb like Saint Lambert, pursuing their deductions from

the primal error which denies to the human spirit all *a priori* notions and judgments"—in which last phrases there may lurk nearly as much error as in sensationalism. He denounces in strong language, but not stronger than it deserves, the miserable philosophy (if philosophy it can be called) of Helvetius and the sensualist school of France, which gave a wrong direction to what would otherwise have been good in the French Revolution.

We are surprised to find at this place he does not notice Hume, who undermined all the older philosophy still cherished in his day, and added agnosticism (as it is now called) to sensationalism, deriving all our knowledge from impressions or sensations, and yet giving no reality to sensations, thus starting the leading philosophical heresy of our day, which runs through the systems of the two Mills, of Bain, of Lewes and of Herbert Spencer.

Dr. Dabney takes up James Mill, who first followed the trade of a preacher in the Church of Scotland, and not getting a charge for which he was an applicant went up to London and gave up all religion, natural and revealed; became, in the *Westminster Review*, one of the leaders of infidelity; and published his "Analysis of the Human Mind," in which he contrives in a superficial manner to account for all the high qualities of the mind, imagination, conscience and will, by sensation and association of sensations, in all this simply following Hume.

Our author once more crosses the English channel, and turns to M. Comte, who, if not just a sensationalist, constructed a huge system of positivism, in which he gave a very bald view of the history of philosophy in the past, making it first theological, then metaphysical, and now positive; whereas a high philosophy has had all along, and should now embrace, the whole of these and give each its place; beginning with facts, rising to principles, and culminating in God. Comte denies to man the power of discovering causes and moral good, and thus undermines all philosophy and all theology—except, indeed, the worship of woman.

From this place, Dr. Dabney's arrangement of systems is not so definite, while his discussion becomes fully fresher. He treats of what he calls the "false evolution theory," which, though not the same as sensualism, joins on to it in making mind materialistic. He does not inquire whether there may not be a true evolution theory, in which evolution properly explained and confined to its own province is represented as simply God's method of procedure, connecting the present causally with the past and the future, and one means of giving its unity

to nature. To my knowledge a great many young men, especially those who know natural history, would be grateful to have the evolution which is manifestly in nature so expounded as to save them from sensualism and atheism.

Dr. Dabney criticizes Hamilton and Mansell. Neither of these men is a sensualist or sensationalist. Both have given admirable defenses of man's spiritual nature. But both have fallen into errors, which Dr. Dabney points out. Both made our knowledge relative, that is, simply of the relations of things themselves unknown, and thus landed themselves without perceiving it in agnosticism. They both make our idea of the infinite negative. But surely there is something positive in our idea of the infinity of God, if only we could apprehend it and express it. Our author enters into a wrestling match with Hamilton as to whether the idea of infinity involves a contradiction. It has always appeared to me that there is a good deal of logomachy in Hamilton's argument, and it is difficult for an opponent not to fall into a like sin.

Mr. John Stuart Mill is a much more enlightened thinker than his father. The book on Induction in his *Logic* is one of the great works of the century. But the metaphysics which run through his *Logic* are at once sensationist and agnostic, and are liable to the objections taken so acutely by Dr. Dabney.

He has touched on Herbert Spencer, the ablest philosophic speculator of our day. But Spencer is not a mere sensualist. He calls in profound principles which lead him on to agnosticism, and these will require to be searchingly examined by higher arguments than those employed to put down a sensual philosophy. Dr. Dabney's closing chapters on ethics and religion are the most useful in the volume.

By this book Dr. Dabney is doing good service at once to philosophy, morality, and religion. We have scarcely any fault to find with the book. The style, if not always academic, is always clear. Self-confident youths will insist that it is too sermonic, and that they prefer drawing the moral for themselves, which, however, they often neglect to do, and so our author does it for them. It may sometimes be more expedient to let youths draw in the lessons unconsciously. We are inclined to think that Dr. Dabney too often disposes of a theory by showing that it leads to evil consequences, whereas his first business as a philosopher should be to show wherein lies the error from which the pernicious results follow. It has often happened that new scientific doctrines which have been charged with being injurious to religion—as, for instance, geological truths—have, when properly understood, turned out to be favorable to it.

BUT WHAT NEXT? Dr. Dabney has shown us the negative side. But the thinking soul can no more live on negations than the body can live in empty space. There are forms of philosophy now prevailing which logically issue in as blank a result as even sensationalism. Suppose that the thinking youth abandons sensualism, whither is he now to turn? The remainder of this paper may be profitably employed in contemplating the philosophic systems which are spreading out their attractions before us in the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

The Modern English School. We so call it for want of a more specific name. It sprang originally from Hume, and has come down to us through James Mill, John Mill, Lewes and Bain, and is now represented by Herbert Spencer and his followers, such as Fisk and Grant Allen, and, to some extent, by Sully. It is quite as defective as the sensational school, to which it adds the subtleties of agnosticism. It derives all our ideas from sensation, but goes farther, and doubts whether our senses give us any reality. It is the agnosticism of the day, and is ably defended by Huxley and Spencer. Let us notice some of its glaring omissions.

Even in sense perception it omits, it entirely leaves out, the existence of body as a substance, making it a mere sensation or impression. With Mr. John Mill it is the "mere possibility of sensations." Our inner sense, or self-consciousness, is not supposed to give us any knowledge of self, or of anything beyond feelings; with Mr. Mill it is merely a series of "feelings aware of themselves," and cannot recognize or sanction personal identity. Memory is represented as a mere reproduction of our sensations or feelings, whereas it is the recognition of an object as having been before us in time past, thus giving us the idea of time. The idea of infinity has, and can have, no place in the system. The number of relations which the mind can discover is very scanty:—with some, such as Professor Bain, it is merely that of resemblance and difference, and the deeper relations, such as those of substance and quality, of identity, of cause and effect, are left out. Causation is merely invariable antecedence and consequence. Emotions, such as those of hope and fear, of approval and remorse, are mere sensory feelings, whereas they have all an underlying appetite and an idea of an object as appetible or unappetible. Moral good in the last resort is happiness, or rather mere pleasure. Free will is impossible, as all things are governed by physical necessity. There can be no proof that a soul so meanly endowed is entitled to immortality; it is not worth preserving, any more than the soul of the brute is. The argument for the existence of God utterly

fails on a system which does not allow us from the traces of design in nature to argue a designer. Any God started as an hypothesis must, as Herbert Spencer maintains, be unknown and unknowable. This agnostic philosophy of the close of the nineteenth century is no better than the sensualistic philosophy of the previous ages.

The German School, beginning with Kant and culminating in Hegel, or branching off with Lotze. There are passages in Dr. Dabney's work which sound as if he might adopt the method and the leading principles of this philosophy. He calls in "*a priori* ideas and judgments," and claims to be a rationalist in philosophy. But this school, logically followed out as it has lately been, issues in as fatal consequences as even sensationalism. It makes the mind perceive not things, but merely phenomena, in the sense of appearances, from which appearances we can never logically infer the existence of things without having more in the conclusion than in the premises. It supposes that in all its cognitive acts the mind adds forms to things; it makes the mind create space and time, to which it gives a mere subjective existence. It does the same with substance and quality, with cause and effect. But if the mind can create these and superinduce them upon things, why may it not create, as with Fichte, the things themselves, till all existence is made ideal? We are thus kept from real things in a region of imaginary forms, and in the end are landed logically in nihilism. It is a notable circumstance that Herbert Spencer and all agnostics, when pushed hard, fall back on Kant.

The School of Physiological Psychology. This department has been cultivated earnestly by a few men in Germany and in France for the last age or two. Lately it has been imported into the United States, where we have the able and elaborate work of Professor Ladd, of Yale. We have other diligent cultivators of the subject, such as Stanley Hall, Cattell, and Yastrow. The tendency of the school is to become narrow and exclusive. It claims to be the whole of psychology, whereas it is only a part, or rather, to use a biological phrase, only the environment of the mind. Physiological psychology has discovered a number of curious facts and a few important facts. But the peculiar, the great benefit derived from mental science as taught in America, has been that it has brought young men into constant connection with mental, moral, and spiritual ideas so fitted to elevate the mind. A physiological psychology, cultivated exclusively, may lead practically to materialism quite as certainly as the sensualism exposed by Dr. Dabney. Those who look to it as furnishing a knowledge of the proper acts of the mind,

or as being a philosophy, will find that they have got the husk but not the nut.

The Scottish School; what are we to make of it? From 1763-'64, when Reid published his "Inquiry," down to the middle of this century, this school had influence, not only in Scotland, but in the Irish province of Ulster, throughout America, and even in England and in France. It is now somewhat in the background. In Scotland, besides others, it has two able representatives in Prof. Calderwood and Prof. Flint, both attached to the Scottish school, but pursuing an independent course; and it is hoped that Prof. Seth, lately appointed to St. Andrews, will advance towards it rather than Hegelianism. On the other hand, it is counteracted by two brilliant men, the brothers Caird, of Glasgow, who have created some interest in Hegelianism, and will stand by it till it dies a natural death. In other countries the Scottish philosophy has at present very little power, and is not likely to have a revival. One reason for this is that it is not pretentious. It has not raised huge systems like those of Fichte, Schelling, Hegel and Lotze, who for the last age or two have so awed and prostrated the minds of young men. The school does not claim to have discovered all truth and settled all difficulties. In the view of ambitious youth it has the Scottish weakness of *canniness*.

On several very important points it is very defective. I do not wish it to be understood that I am ashamed of my country or my country's philosophy; but I have been declaring all along, in the old country and in this, that the Scottish school has errors which ought to be abandoned. It does not declare clearly, unambiguously and firmly, that we know things. Reid and Stewart say that we know qualities and not things, whereas the true account is, that we know things with their qualities. Hamilton resolutely argues that man's knowledge is relative and not positive; not of things, but of the relation of things themselves unknown. This doctrine has not, so far as I know, been disavowed by Hamilton's pupils, Prof. Fraser, of Edinburgh, nor Prof. Veitch, of Glasgow. It has in fact given a starting point to Herbert Spencer's nescience, and all the consequences he has drawn from it. I have been calling on the followers of Hamilton to show that the conclusions of Spencer do not follow logically from the principles laid down by their master. Hitherto they have failed to do this.

An American student in brooding over these systems may find a difficulty in accepting any one of them, and he may unfortunately be allured into agnosticism, or be led to abandon the study. How are we

to meet this tendency? Some will answer: Take what is good from all systems and reject the evil. But this only starts the question: On what principle are we to make the selection, that is, on what system are we to proceed? An eclectic system may be a heterogeneous and an utterly inconsistent mass, which will not cohere any more than the gold, silver, brass, iron and clay in the image seen by Nebuchadnezzar, "which was broken in pieces together and became like the chaff of the summer threshing floor." There is only one course for American students in these circumstances: Let them look into their own mind by self-consciousness, which will act as a magnet to draw out the metals and leave the clay. As they do this they will find out the truth, each for himself, and we shall have an American philosophy, which this country has not yet had. This I have long desired to see. I wish I could raise a cry sufficiently clear and ringing to be heard and bring such a philosophy to us. Let it hasten to fill up the vacuum at present existing.

In accordance with the American character this philosophy will take the form of realism. It will be opposed to sensationalism on the one hand and to idealism on the other; to sensationalism which draws all our ideas from the senses, and idealism which seeks to add to nature out of the riches of the mind and to mend things which it only mars. I am not speaking against idealism, which has its place but should be kept in its place. We do not allow idealism to come into science, to improve the laws of nature, to make gravitation and chemical affinity more attractive. Just as little should we allow it a place in philosophy.

Americans are a composite people, drawn from all nations of the Old World, but brought into a unity by their republican constitution and laws. So it will be with the American philosophy. It will be ready to take in truth from Greek and Roman, from Britain and Germany, but it will subordinate all to its observational method. It will proceed with the Scottish philosophy in the inductive method, but in pursuing this method, with consciousness as the agent of observation, it will discover the *a priori* truths of Kant, prior to experience, above experience, and having their authority in themselves.

This is the REALISM which in a crude state is the first philosophy, and, as purified by careful inspection, is to be the final philosophy. It begins with self and with body as affecting self, both being realities. It does not attempt to prove these by mediate probation. If it did not assume them it could never prove them. It assumes them and justifies itself in assuming them. Assuming them as real, it regards as equally

real all the careful inductions and logical deductions from them, and thus lives in a world of realities. It is not the vulgar realism which looks merely at the surface of things. It draws distinctions which separate between our original and acquired perceptions, between the real and the additions which man may have superinduced. It becomes a discerning and enlightened realism, which looks on things as God has made them.

JAMES McCOSH.

Princeton College, N. J.

BIBLE STUDY IN COLLEGE—THE METHODS.

The views advanced in a former article on Bible Study in College are not merely speculative and theoretical. It is possible to make a liberal education distinctively scriptural and christian. The distinctive mark of the cordage of the Royal British navy is an imperishable red thread twisted into every strand of the rope. The rope maker finds it easy enough to introduce it in the process of manufacture. All education ought to have the distinctive red thread of divine truth running through the whole; but the educator must intertwine it with all other truth in the very process of education.

The writer has been directly engaged for seventeen years in reducing his views to practice in the class-room, and he maintains that the problem presents no real difficulty. A concrete plan, matured and verified by experience, is better than elaborate argument and skilful speculation, and far more easily understood and appreciated. Let this be the writer's apology for presenting his own methods in this brief article.

1. Bible study is put into the rank of the severe studies, both for time and work. The course is a three-years' course, called junior, intermediate and senior, and three hours a week are given to each class. Latin, Greek and mathematics can claim no more time. A partial, limited and easy course is not valued in any department because it calls for no effort. Successful labor generates a student's enthusiasm. We therefore coördinate Bible study with the severe studies.

2. The studies of this course are enforced by the same sanctions as others; the same system of grading daily recitations; the same written examinations; the same distinctions for excellence. Graduation in the "Bible Course Proper" is necessary to every degree, and every student in the regular classes of the University is required to take one or more classes of the Bible course every year till it is completed. Some are

afraid of such a system, lest the compulsory study of the Bible excite disgust and hostility on the part of the student. Such fears are groundless, for experience proves that exactly the reverse is true. In these classes there is generated an interest and enthusiasm such as is rarely seen in other departments of study. In this the writer speaks advisedly, for he has had large experience in teaching other things.

3. The English Bible is the text-book. No helps are required to be handled by the classes except a Bible dictionary and a biblical geography and atlas. Commentaries and paraphrases and Bible histories and other books about the Bible would only divert attention from the real text-book. There is a common fallacy just here. Classes study a book about English literature, and they suppose they are studying English literature; so we often read and study books about the Bible and suppose we are studying the Bible. These may often be of value as books of reference, but it is a curious fact that none but advanced students can use books of reference to much advantage in any department of study, and they are profited in proportion to their previous knowledge of the subject.

4. The mastery of the contents of the Scriptures by careful study and class-room drill is the leading aim of the course. We begin at the beginning and pursue the order of the history, and take the books mainly in consecutive order. The historical clue is made to throw light on the doctrinal and devotional books, which are studied only by appropriate reference and comparison throughout the entire course. Scripture is made to interpret Scripture at every point. Technical theology is excluded from the class-room, except as it is suggested in the concrete facts and statements of Scripture. Thus the theology of the class-room is biblical rather than dogmatic; concrete, rather than abstract; and a proper foundation is laid for subsequent study of technical theology. An incidental advantage to the student is familiarity with the Bible as a book and ease and skill in handling it. Another advantage is the enhanced interest with which he reads and hears everything which touches the Scriptures all his life after this study of them.

5. A syllabus of every lesson is put into the hands of the pupil. This syllabus is a table of contents or exhaustive analysis of the parts of Scripture assigned for preparation by the class. It is not a set of questions, though some of the heads are thrown into the form of questions. It serves rather as an indicator to the pupil to direct his study of the text. A class will hardly master a few chapters assigned for a

lesson by simply reading them over once or twice without such an indicator. This syllabus or analysis, constructed on the principle of topical divisions and subdivisions, refers to every verse in the lesson by number and to such parallel references as may be necessary to the elucidation of the text. This makes the mastery of the lesson easier and the right comprehension of it far more certain, before the student comes to the class-room. In the class-room questions are asked, *ex animo et ex ore*, just as the exigencies of class-drill may seem to demand, and such explanations are given as seem suited to the grade of the class and the stage of the course. Many questions are answered in brief as they arise, or are postponed to a later period of the course for full discussion, partly because their consideration requires a previous mastery of the entire Scriptures in detail, and partly because students of the lower grades have not had sufficient mental training to grapple successfully with such questions. In making explanations the teacher must avoid commonplaces and rely largely on the perspicuity of Scripture and the native common sense of the class, stimulating it when necessary by question and answer on the Socratic method, rather than by tedious harangues. So, also, in applying the truth, there should be no cant, nor mere preaching, nor exhortation, nor effort at spiritualizing, but let the truth sharply defined do its own work, and let the natural conscience and God's Spirit work through the word mastered. By pursuing this course in the main, the teacher is the better able on proper occasion to drive a nail and clinch it hard in the way of personal application, either to strengthen the wavering, comfort the mourner, warn the unruly or convince the gainsayer.

The pupils are all required to have tablet and pencil, and to take notes of explanations given in class, and to copy the same afterwards, to be inspected by the professor. The value of this exercise cannot be overestimated. It secures constant attention, so difficult in large classes; it secures review and redigestion of the lesson after the recitation; it secures the oral instructions of the teacher from being lost, and it cultivates the valuable habit of attending and thinking and writing at the same time. The facility acquired in this last by many, during a three-years' course, is itself no mean reward for their diligence.

6. The scheme of the course is as follows: The junior course (the lowest) begins with Genesis and ends with Samuel's administration. The student is expected to study every chapter and verse, and to master the history, the biography, the prophecy, the geography, the typology and the archaeology of that period, elucidated with sufficient

references to the later Scriptures. The inspiration of the Scriptures is assumed, and the pupil taught to accept them as the infallible Word of God and the final standard of appeal for the truth. And he is taught to interpret them according to the simplest dictates of common sense. The refinements of an "advanced scholarship," if true, would be absolutely valueless to pupils of this grade, while the foundations of a simple, childlike faith in the supernatural must be laid in this class, if laid at all.

The intermediate course (the middle class) begins with King Saul and ends with the death of Herod the Great, soon after the birth of Christ. This includes the remaining historical books and the historico-prophetical books, both previous to and subsequent to the Captivity. The connexions of sacred and profane history are fully pursued down to the time of Christ. The various modifications of the Jewish commonwealth, both before and after the Captivity, are carefully noted and discussed. The relations of Judaism to oriental history, and subsequently to Roman history, are carefully noted and defined; and especially the influence of Judaism on the religions of the East and on the philosophies of the West is indicated and proved, preparatory to fuller discussion and illustration in the senior year.

The comparative study of prophecy and history in this course is extremely fascinating to the diligent student. It gives him the key to all history and enables him to recognize God in history at every point. By the time he has reached the end of this course he is prepared to realize that the "Seed of the woman" is "Head over all things to the church." Without this clue, all history is a labyrinth, dark and pathless. By following this clue the class is able to see the triumphs of Judaism and the preparation of the world for the coming of Christ, in the "fulness of time."

The senior course (the third year) embraces the life of Christ, studied on the plan of the Harmony, with special attention to miracles, prophecies, types and parables, and with elaborate studies of the Sermon on the Mount. It includes also the Book of Acts and the setting of the church in order. More than half of this course is made up of *resumé* studies on the entire Scriptures in the form of lectures. Numerous topics are taken up and discussed exhaustively in the light of the entire Scriptures, or else presented in a bird's-eye view for the confirmation of faith; for example, The Unities of Scripture, The Sabbath, The Family, The Bible and Science, The Hebrew Commonwealth in full detail, The Influence of Judaism on the Ancient World, etc.

The Evidences of Christianity are treated in a brief summary in the remainder of this year. The senior student who has gone over all these courses is already in possession of all the evidences, gathered in detail, and there is really no necessity for anything more than a mere summing up with the help of a popular text-book.

7. The writer's *ideal* of this Bible course is to make it the *unifying course of all sound learning*. He would make it touch human thought and action at every point. He would traverse every domain of earthly knowledge for confirmation and illustration of Divine truth. He would make God's Word unify all history, illustrate every science, answer all heresies, confirm all that is good, and furnish a key to the Babel of human voices and speculations, and, above all, give a solid basis for faith from creation to final redemption, from Eden to the New Jerusalem.

This is the ideal. "Who is sufficient for these things?" The *ideal teacher* of such a course begins with a thorough knowledge of all Scripture, so as to compare Scripture with Scripture; then a practical knowledge of the original tongues of the Bible; then a mastery of the whole field of Biblical literature, and skill to discern withal; then an ample store of universal knowledge, and then strong common-sense to enable him at the same time to instruct the simple and excite new interest in the most gifted. You nor I will ever realize this ideal, but we may reach after it more and more.

J. B. SHEARER.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1888.

At the hour of 11 A. M., on Thursday, May 17, we saw a large audience assembled in the roomy Franklin Street Church, Baltimore, with the pastor, Dr. W. U. Murkland, in the pulpit, Dr. G. B. Strickler's calm, smoothly-shaven face on the right, and Dr. William Adams' black eyes glowing on the left. A new, and, as it proved, a finely-toned organ threw up its lofty pipes in the rear of the pulpit. As these pipes were painted in soft olive greens, with only here and there a touch of gold and warm brown tints, the eye had some relief from the Sahara of buff that covered the walls of the church. The windows, however, were decidedly tasteful, and a very pretty one in the northeast corner, designed by Dr. Murkland, perpetuates the memory of Dr. Plumer, a former pastor of the church.

After the usual preliminary services, including an excellent prayer by Dr. Adams, Dr. Strickler, the retiring moderator, took for his text John xv. 5, "I am the vine, ye are the branches," and proceeded to dis-

cuss the mystical union of Christ and the church. This doctrine is most precious to all believers and was ably and scripturally presented by the preacher. Dr. Strickler showed himself to be a clear thinker and a ready speaker. In his style, perhaps the most noteworthy feature was the directness of aim in his words to express his thoughts, with a commendable absence of the "ambitious" element.

After the closing hymn, Dr. Murkland delivered a graceful address of welcome, closing with a graphic description of his experience in climbing high up into a church spire in Antwerp, wherein he left below him first the rumble and roar of the busy streets, and then the chiming of the bells in the tower, so that there was nothing now above him but heaven.

The moderator took his seat, the roll was called, and the election of a new moderator was in order. The venerable Dr. William Brown nominated Dr. J. J. Bullock, of the Presbytery of Maryland. Rev. S. I. Reid, of Arkansas, nominated Dr. S. A. King, of Texas. Rev. F. J. Brooke, of Lexington Presbytery, Va., nominated Dr. J. R. Graham, of Winchester, Va. The merits of the respective candidates were set forth by their advocates; two of them tried in vain to withdraw their names. The three cast their individual votes and retired from the room; and then the roll was called, and each man cried out his choice. We had expected a ballot instead of a *viva voce* vote. The result was that Dr. Bullock was elected by a considerable majority over both the others combined, which was well, perhaps, considering the age of Dr. Bullock and his having been pastor of the very church in which the Assembly was sitting.

This may be a proper place to say that there was much geniality, and indeed no little pleasantry, on the floor of the Assembly, and we were not all reminded of a gloomy conclave of inquisitors seeking to destroy Galileo Galilei. For instance, when sundry speakers were extolling their favorite candidates for the moderatorship, some of them seemed to think that the time of making of puns had come. A language in which punning is impossible is a great philological *desideratum*, and we have looked wistfully toward Volapuk in this regard. But since our linguistic needs are infinite, or well nigh so, and language is finite, one word must ever bear two or more meanings, and there is no help for us. It is, on the other hand, due to the brethren who favored us on this occasion to state that, in point of sedateness, we might say even lugubriousness, their puns were unrivalled and beyond all praise.

Dr. Bullock has a distinguished presence, presided with ability, urbanity, and firmness, and his rulings were sustained with a single exception. Even in this he decided in strict accordance with the old Book. The question was demanded on a substitute. In former days we said "the previous question"; and when this was seconded it cut off all debate, all substitutes, all amendments that had not been accepted, and brought the "main question" to a vote. The main question was the original motion, together with any amendments that had been accepted by the mover and his second, or had been approved by the house. Dr. Bullock's ruling was in agreement with this; but on appeal from his decision it was held that, by more recent parliamentary practice, the question could be called on a substitute, and if the substitute was negatived, the original motion, with its amendments, might be still further discussed.

REUNION.

Dr. H. M. Smith, of New Orleans, then gained the floor to offer this resolution :

Resolved, That the report of the Committee of Inquiry be adopted, and their fidelity and diligence be commended. The Assembly expresses its hearty gratification at the spirit of christian courtesy that has marked the sessions of these committees; at the same time it appears, from the facts now laid before us, that there has been no change in the relative attitude of the two bodies on questions of fundamental importance. In view of this, and of the decided opposition of some of our Presbyteries, which we judge to represent the prevalent sentiment of our people, we are constrained to believe that the further agitation of the pending question of organic union would interrupt the harmony and usefulness of our beloved church as a church of Christ. With sincere and fraternal regards, therefore, for our brethren of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, and with the hope that we may be blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly things in Christ, and with a hope of all things practicable, there may be coöperation and harmony between us in the service of our common Lord and Master, this Assembly deems it inexpedient to prosecute the subject further, and the committee is hereby discharged.

Dr. Smith, after reading this resolution, moved that it be made the order of the day for Friday morning, and the whole matter disposed of. It was judged by the Assembly that this action would be precipitate; but on motion of Dr. H. G. Hill, of North Carolina, the report of the Committee of Conference (or Inquiry) was made the first order for Friday morning.

Accordingly, after the announcement of the committees and the reference of various overtures to the proper committees, and brief state-

ments of the subject-matter of overtures not yet referred, Dr. Strickler presented the report of the Committee of Conference with the committee of the Northern Assembly. Dr. Smith then offered his resolution.

Rev. S. M. Neel, of the Presbytery of Louisville, thought the action proposed premature, discourteous to the Northern Assembly, hasty, and not likely to produce harmony among ourselves. Another member proposed the raising of a special committee. Another said that this question was coming: it was like Banquo's ghost, in that it would not down. He respected the fathers of the church, but if they did not get out of the way they would be run over. (It is presumed that it was not meant that they would be run over by Banquo's ghost, but by the car of . . . progress.) He had been a soldier, but had laid aside resentment and hatred.

Dr. William Brown thought the action would be "previous." He agreed with Mr. Neel on this point. It ought to be referred to the Committee on Bills and Overtures, which had been carefully selected from various parts of the church; and it would be unusual and hardly courteous to take the matter out of their hands.

Dr. Campbell, of St. Joseph, Mo., preferred a special committee, consisting of two members, viz., a minister and an elder, from each Synod. The Committee on Bills and Overtures already had their hands too full of business.

Dr. Smoot moved, as a substitute for everything proposed, that the papers be referred to the Committee on Bills and Overtures, and they be instructed to report at their earliest convenience; and this was adopted.

Instead of being the first important matter settled, however, it was the last. The committee reported on the 10th day, Monday, May 28th, in the afternoon session.

The report was in substance—

1st. That the obstacles to organic union had not been to any considerable extent removed by the conference of the two committees appointed by the Northern and Southern Assemblies; that it is best for us to remain a distinct member of the body of which Christ is the head.

2nd, That our thanks were due to our own committee, and that the committee be now discharged.

3rd, That we reciprocate the kind sentiments of our Northern brethren, and desire to forget dissensions and to follow after all things pure, lovely and of good report.

4th, That we appoint a committee to confer with a similar committee of the Northern Church, if one shall be appointed by them, on coöperation in christian work at home and abroad, so far as may be practicable; our committee to report to the next Assembly.

The paper was taken up *seriatim*.

Rev. R. C. Reed moved to amend by saying that the obstacles have not been entirely removed. This was warmly discussed, but finally voted down.

Dr. Burkhead hoped that reunion would soon be effected, and offered a substitute that a committee of inquiry or conference be appointed to see if the obstacles could not be removed. This was supported by Dr. Campbell, of Missouri, but was lost.

The consideration of the report was resumed on Tuesday morning, at 10 o'clock. Dr. Campbell, of Missouri, offered as a substitute the appointment of a committee, consisting of three ministers and two ruling elders, to confer again with the Northern Assembly. We saw no substantial difference between this substitute and that of Dr. Burkhead, which had been negatived on Monday afternoon, and hence we regarded this part of the discussion as out of order. But we did not raise the point of order.

The substitute was lost by over 70 noes to (we believe) 49 ayes.

From the stenographic reports in the Baltimore daily papers and the *Christian Observer* of Louisville, supplemented by our private notes, we had intended to give a synopsis of the discussion, but it would take too much space in the QUARTERLY.

The report of the Committee on Bills and Overtures at last came to a vote *seriatim*. After mentioning the various papers on reunion that had been placed in their hands, the committee recommended the adoption of the following paper:

"1. After a careful consideration of the report of our Committee of Inquiry, we are unable to discover that the obstacles to organic union heretofore existing between the Northern and Southern General Assemblies have to any considerable extent been removed; therefore, in view of all the interests involved, we continue established in the conviction that the cause of truth and righteousness, as well as the peace and prosperity of our beloved Zion, will be best promoted by remaining as we have been, a distinct member of that one body, the church of which the Lord Jesus Christ is the supreme and ever-living Head."

This clause was carried by 63 ayes to 55 noes. The majority would probably have been larger but for some objection to the phrase "the cause of truth and righteousness."

The second clause, commending and discharging the Committee of Inquiry, passed without opposition.

The third clause expressed appreciation of the generous and munificent hospitality of our Northern brethren in the matter of the Centennial celebration, joy in the vast and precious heritage of Presbyterian truth and order held by us in common with others, and a desire to forget, as far as possible, all past dissensions; and closed by the exhortation: "Let us walk by the same rule; let us mind the same thing, trusting that if in anything we be otherwise minded, God will reveal even this unto us." Carried, with only one dissenting voice, which caused some amusement.

The fourth clause recommended the appointment of a Committee of Coöperation in work at home and abroad. Dr. R. S. Campbell, of Missouri, offered a substitute expressing gratification at learning that the Northern Assembly had continued its Committee of Conference with us; frankly confessing the belief that the time for organic union is not yet; and recommending that the Southern Assembly continue its committee as a committee of *conference* and enlarge its numbers. This was lost by the very close vote of 60 to 62. At this point, the time being 1:10 P. M., the train to leave at 2, the writer was constrained to retire from the house. From a daily paper we learn that a vote on the paper offered by the Committee of Bills and Overtures was taken by ayes and noes; whereupon it appears that there were 88 ayes and 40 noes.

S. A. King, T. C. Whaling, R. K. Smoot, J. W. Storey, J. F. Thompson and L. C. Mills had leave to enter on the records their reason for voting no on the paper as a whole, containing these words:

" . . . While we approved of most of the recommendations of the paper, we could not vote for the adoption of the report as a whole because it provides for a Committee of Conference with a view to coöperation, which, in the judgment of the Northern Assembly, as expressed in their action appointing a similar committee, can be most efficiently prosecuted only as the result of the organic union of the two churches."

On the whole matter of organic union we offer the following suggestions to the readers of THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY:

1st, Every family, commonwealth and kingdom ought to manage its own affairs. The early Norman kings of England held a claim of sovereignty over a large part of France; but, after so long a time, and after much bloodshed, England had to be content with ruling England, and France, for better or for worse, ruled France. So, also, England

has ceased to rule the United States of America, and her control of Canadian affairs has been greatly curtailed. God has not intended the world to be one great empire.

The same principles apply to the church in large measure. The churches in foreign lands must be taught to stand on their own feet and take care of their own interests. It will not do for men in one land to legislate for men in another. It will not do for men in one section to control the men of another section in matters in which the inhabitants of the one section are not specially affected by the legislation, civil or ecclesiastical, while those of the other section are vitally concerned. The Southern Presbyterian Church has now its autonomy. If history and human experience have taught anything, they have taught that it is unwise to place one's self in the power of other people. At present there may be an abundance of kind feeling; but there is no need of shutting our eyes on the past.

2nd. The argument based on the duty of loving our brethren has been very zealously pressed, but it is inconclusive. Of course it is our duty to love our brethren of the North, many of whom are most worthy of our christian affection. So we are to love our neighbors, but it is not our duty to live in the same house with them. This would not promote peace and charity. We are to love brethren of non-Presbyterian churches also, but not to dissolve our own ecclesiastical organization. Would there be more love if we were all in one vast church? I trow not. There are too many causes of dissension, too many matters about which we disagree,—at all events for the present. In former years the New School reproached the Old School for want of love, because they would no longer affiliate with the Congregationalists. But time taught the New School better. Let us listen to TIME.

3rd. The oft-adduced argument from John xvii. is based on a papistical exegesis. Bellarmine himself would have been pleased with some of the remarks of honored brethren on the floor of the Assembly. That the church in all lands should be one organism, and thus that the world of the ungodly should know that Christ is sent from the Father, and that the world cannot perceive the spiritual unity of the church, but only its external—or, as the current phrase goes, organic union—is sound old Roman Catholicism. Brethren ought to be careful how they express themselves in the heat of debate, lest they give aid and countenance to the pope and his cardinals.

In opposition to this Romish exegesis it was excellently said that the Presbyterian Church is not one denomination, but a family of de-

nominations. Or we may liken it to different regiments in a *corps d'armée*, each bearing aloft its bonnie blue flag, and all marching on to battle and to victory.

4th, It is pleasant to be assured that the Boys in Grey, who bore Confederate swords and muskets for four long years, have ceased from the animosities of the war. But it is very unjust to imply that all who take a different view as to the wisest and safest policy of the church of to-day are animated by a spirit of hatred and revenge. God forbid that this should be so! If any one minister or elder of our beloved church cherishes malign sentiments toward our Northern brethren, may the Holy Ghost renew a right spirit within him. May he lay aside all malice and all guile, and hypocrisies and envies, and all evil-speaking.

5th, We once asked that famous surgeon, Dr. B. W. Dudley, of Lexington, Ky., which of the European medical schools he had liked best while a student abroad. He replied that he thought he had received benefit from all his teachers, but most of all from Dr. Abernethy of Guy's Hospital, London, whose great apothegm was that there was no general disease of the system that might not manifest itself locally, and no local disease that might not manifest itself generally. Let us learn wisdom from this sagacious man. Any false doctrine of any part of the re-united church might most readily, by our system of church government, come before us for adjudication. We have enough to contend with in our own body without importing diseases from the North; and they have enough without importing from us. It would be bad for any part of our land to be subject to the pulmonary complaints of the North, and also to the malaria and yellow fever of the South.

6th, Before our church takes any further steps toward organic reunion, everybody ought to know what course the Northern Assembly pursued toward the church in Kentucky after the formation of the Southern Presbyterian Church. The "Declaration and Testimony" paper contained some very sound doctrine, but spoke, we always thought, with unseemly asperity of the Northern Assembly. We will now quote from Rev. Dr. Miles Saunders, the careful and accurate historian of Transylvania Presbytery:

"The General Assembly met in St. Louis, in May, 1866, and in its organization refused seats to the commissioners of Louisville Presbytery, on the ground that the Presbytery had adopted the 'Declaration and Testimony,' and that the commissioners were signers of the same. It condemned the 'Declaration and Testimony' as a slander upon the church (Minutes, p. 473). It summoned the signers to appear at the bar of the next Assembly, to answer for what they had done in this

matter (Minutes, p. 473). It forbade them to sit as members of any church court higher than the session, and ordered resolution 4 (page 473): 'That if any Presbytery shall disregard this action of the General Assembly and at any meeting shall enroll as entitled to a seat or seats in the body one or more of the persons designated in the preceding resolutions and summoned to appear before the next Assembly, then that Presbytery shall *ipso facto* be dissolved' (page 474)."

As Dr. Saunders' full sketch was sent on to the stated clerk of our Assembly in May, 1888, and is on file with him, and a part of it has been published recently, we need add only that some members of Presbytery felt that they could not be the executioners of the Assembly without violating ordination vows; and, by this ecclesiastical "Alien and Sedition Law," they were thrust out of Transylvania Presbytery.

Do we, then, propose to wave "the bloody shirt?" Not at all. Let the dead past bury its dead. It certainly was extraordinary and melancholy to see some of the truest, staunchest, most orthodox and most attached adherents of the Presbyterian Church thrust out in this way. Madness ruled the hour.

Our point is this: The Northern Assembly never has—so far as we are advised—disallowed its claim of the right to act in this violent and unconstitutional manner. Would we be safe in the proposed union, with five votes to our one? We would very kindly and respectfully call the attention of our Northern brethren to this matter. The discussion and the votes in the Baltimore Assembly showed that organic reunion had a no inconsiderable following. Now, is the Northern Church going to act in the near future so as to convince us that our fears are well-founded? Is it going to maintain its long silence on this subject, and thus leave us shut up to the belief that it holds fast to its claim of the right to *ipso facto* ministers of the church, whenever it shall see fit to do so?

On our way home we fell in, between Baltimore and Washington, with a leading minister of the Northern Church, formerly a New School man, who gave it as his conviction that the New School Assembly never would have taken that action of the Old School Assembly of 1866. What has the reunited Northern Church to say on the subject? If nothing, then how unwise it would be for the Southern Presbyterian Church, under a great clamor about charity, to bolt into a union with an overshadowing body! Marry in haste, and repent at leisure.

7th, By a novel, and, as we firmly believe, untenable decision, the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Walnut Street Church case, has bound itself to sustain, in all questions involving property, the findings of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. The court

refuses to go behind the returns. It examines our church government so far as to learn that we have a last court of appellate jurisdiction; then closes the book and refuses to entertain any question concerning the constitutionality of the edicts of the Assembly. It cannot understand our church government, forsooth, as well as our Assemblies do. This is a return to mediævelism. The church hands recusants over to the civil authorities; and the civil authorities enforce the church's decrees. We do not think that fifty years will elapse before the state will see how it has humiliated itself in thus assuming the rôle of a Jack Cade. For the present, it has made it more or less dangerous to be a Presbyterian. The decision, unwittingly of course, is in favor of extreme independency. Are you about to build a church, or to endow a college or theological seminary? Be very guarded about the charter, and the property rights, or else some Assembly will figure in the case, and you may lose all you have invested. One of the speakers referred to the Danville Theological Seminary; he had been told by Northern brethren that the South had no equitable rights in that endowment. Now, that seminary was originally founded as a distinctively Southern institution, in the South, and for the South. A large part of the money was contributed by Southern men. To-day they have no control of a single dollar of its funds. The same is true of Centre College. After all the greetings, the hurrahs, the rising votes, the doxologies, the immense enthusiasms of our Northern Assemblies, the sad and painful fact remains, that, in language attributed to one of the leading men of the Northern Synod of Kentucky, "one-third of the Presbyterians of Kentucky hold every dollar of those endowments." He is reported to have said on the floor of his Synod that this was "very strange." We agree with him. We have no bitterness in the case. But we are mystified. Can any one wonder that some of us feel unwilling to advise our Southern people to enter into a partnership involving these perils? What would the Assembly of the Organic Union Church require us to do? No man can foretell. If we should feel constrained to disobey, out we go; and away go our painfully gathered endowments, our churches, our glebes. Alas! Alas!

OUR BROTHER IN BLACK.

We played with him in childhood; we sometimes take him kindly by the hand to-day. We help him on occasion. We have rescued six millions from fetichism, cannibalism, and voodooism. In Kentucky every dollar of taxes paid by our brother in black is devoted to the edu-

cation of his children. The expenses of state and municipal governments fall on the whites exclusively. We have preached to our brother in black the same sweet gospel which saves ourselves. We would willingly do so again, but he does not often give us the chance. In fact, he does not relish our staid style of oratory, and would rather be off to himself. Yet we wish him well, and hope to rejoice with him in heaven. But he is not welcome to our bed and board. We do not desire him for a son-in-law; we do not wish him to call on our daughters in a social way; and we are not willing that our grandchildren shall be mulattoes.

We believe that the race instinct has been divinely implanted in order to prevent the confusion of the blood of races remote from each other, and especially of the Caucasian and the Negro. If all this is sinful, let our fall and spring Presbyteries memorialize the next Assembly at Chattanooga in 1889 to hold a day of fasting and prayer and confession of sin in this regard. And by all means let us invite the Northern Assembly, if not to feast, at least to fast and pray with us; for we apprehend that they are about "as deep in the mud as we are in the mire." We saw three or four of the colored brethren in the ranks between which we marched up to Overbrook, near Philadelphia, and about the same number at the reception in the Academy of Fine Arts, in the "Presbyterian Jam," as some one facetiously styled the concourse; three or four amid hundreds,

Rari nantes in gurgite vasto.

We saw only one white man pay them the slightest attention. He was a returned missionary from China by whom we happened to get a seat. He spoke pleasantly to a brother in black, who turned aside from the throng and stood at the end of the sofa. There was no sitting-room for him. The writer of this article then addressed a few questions to said brother concerning his location and the size of his Presbytery, and would have said more, but either the rush of the throng swept him away, or he allowed himself to be borne off by it.

We have tried negro suffrage in the South, and have found it, as we expected, to be a farce; and we do not care to introduce it into our church courts. If this be ecclesiastical treason, make the most of it.

THE FUTURE OF THE QUESTION.

The discussion disclosed the existence in the Southern Assembly of a Right, a Left, and a Centre, to the last of which the writer adheres.

We shall look with great interest to the course pursued by our Northern brethren in coming years. If they wish to win over the Left to the Centre, the Centre to the Right, and the Right into still closer fraternity, they ought by this time to know how to do it. But if they shall seize and hold endowments, if they shall stint the missionaries in their own border-places and send men and money South to where they will most hamper and distress us, if they shall tamper with ill-paid Southern preachers in the Indian Territory or elsewhere, if they shall alienate the black man of the South from the white man of the South, then for one we say, *God help the Right!* But may a gracious heaven preserve the Presbyterian Church North from this untoward policy: for we are taught of God to love one another, and we hope better things of them, though we thus speak.

THE WOODROW CASE.

This case came up by a complaint of Dr. James Woodrow against the Synod of Georgia, of which he is a member. The examination of the case was greatly facilitated by two pamphlets furnished by Dr. Woodrow himself, and containing the record and evidence, an address on evolution, delivered May 7, 1884, before the Alumni Association of the Columbia Theological Seminary, a speech before the Synod of South Carolina, October 27th and 28th, 1884, and sundry articles from the *Southern Presbyterian*, of which he is the editor; also the argument of said complainant which he read before the Assembly.

The case was referred to the Judicial Committee, of which the writer was a member; and it thus became our duty to ascertain whether the complaint was regularly and properly brought.

A conjecture having arisen that there might be some informality in prosecuting the complaint before this Assembly, it was freely said in the committee that we ought to waive all mere informalities and have the case come to trial. The supposed irregularity finally crystallized into these two points:

1st, By Article 268 of the Book of Order: "Notice of complaint shall be given in the same form and time as notice of appeal." By Article 263: "An appellant shall be considered as abandoning his appeal if he do not appear before the appellate court by the second day of its meeting next ensuing the date of his notice of appeal, unless it shall appear that he was prevented by the providence of God from seasonably prosecuting it."

2nd, Before the Assembly of 1887 had received any notification

from Dr. Woodrow, the Committee on Records of the Synod of Georgia had reported that said records had been examined, and were approved, and the report had been adopted by the Assembly. This was on the third day of the sessions of the Assembly of 1887. On the same day, but at a later hour, Dr. Woodrow's letter was read to the Assembly, notifying them that, owing to the condition of his health, as evidenced by the written statement of his physician, he was providentially debarred from seasonably prosecuting his complaint.

The final result was that majority and a minority reports were presented, as follows:

MAJORITY REPORT.—Your Judicial Committee to which was referred the complaint of Rev. James Woodrow, D. D., against the "Synod of Georgia," respectfully report that they have examined said complaint and the papers therein referred to, and find that while the complaint was not presented by the second day of the General Assembly of 1887, yet your committee are of the opinion that the complainant has brought himself within the exception as provided by Chap. XIII., Sec. III., Par. 9, of our Rules of Discipline, by showing that he was prevented by the providence of God from seasonably prosecuting it. Your committee recommend that said complaint be heard in the order prescribed by our Rules of Discipline, as follows:

1. Hear the record of the case.
2. Hear the complainant.
3. Hear the respondent by its representative.
4. Hear the complainant again.
5. Consider and decide the case.

Signed, J. D. Burkhead, L. G. Barbour, A. A. James, James Hemphill, J. J. White, R. T. Simpson, S. P. Dendy, J. J. Davis, S. P. Greene, J. F. Crowe.

MINORITY REPORT.—The undersigned members of the Judicial Committee to which was referred the complaint with accompanying papers of Rev. James Woodrow, D. D., *vs.* the Synod of Georgia, would report that, having examined the same, and failing to agree with the majority, respectfully beg leave to submit the following minority report:

It is clear from the papers submitted that the complainant failed to lodge his complaint with the clerk of the higher court before the close of the second day of its sessions, as required by Chap. XIII., Sec. III., (260) Par. 6, Book of Church Order, and that, having thus failed to regularly prosecute his complaint, the last Assembly had a right to presume that the complainant had abandoned his complaint, and that Assembly having examined and approved the minutes of the Synod of Georgia, the undersigned members of the committee are of the opinion that the case is barred, and recommend that the complaint be dismissed.

Respectfully submitted. Samuel A. King, A. H. Barkley, B. W. Powell.

In regard to the first point made by the minority, it is plain that we should not confound two distinct things, the appearing of the com-

plainant before the court, either in person or by writing, and his notification that he has been prevented by the providence of God from seasonably prosecuting it. The former must take place by the second day of the meeting of the court next ensuing the date of his notice of appeal (or complaint); but the latter is not so restricted, and the Book of Church Order is judicious in not restricting the time of the notification. It may be well for the complainant, *if he can*, to notify the ensuing Assembly by the second day of its sessions, that he is providentially prevented from prosecuting his complaint; and a complainant ought of course to show due diligence in the matter, and not to leave church courts in needless uncertainty as to the course he intends to pursue. But providential hindrances know no law. A sudden illness, a miscarriage in the mails, a score of unforeseen accidents may retard the delivery of a communication. Hence our book takes a wise course in not fixing any time by or before which a church court shall be notified of the complainant's inability to appear. While it is *extra litem*, it may be stated that Dr. Woodrow's notification was mailed in time to reach the Assembly by the second day, and was delayed to the third day by causes unknown to the Judicial Committee.

Touching the second point, it should be borne in mind that the Committee on Synodical Records is limited to the records which are delivered to it for examination; that the Synod of Georgia, against which the complaint was made, sat in November, 1886; that Dr. Woodrow's notice of complaint was duly made and entered; that on November 20, 1886, he sent his complaint to the stated clerk of Synod, and that nothing subsequent to this could possibly come before the Committee on Records of the Synod of Georgia appointed by the Assembly of 1887. That committee had nothing whatever to do with the questions whether the complaint did or did not appear on the second day of the sessions of May, 1887; whether he was or was not providentially hindered, or, in fine, whether he were still in the church militant or had entered into the church triumphant. These questions might come before the Assembly, but not before a Committee on Records. The Assembly of 1888, therefore, acted strictly according to law in entertaining Dr. Woodrow's complaint.

The case came originally before the Presbytery of Augusta, Ga., August 16, 1886, at which an indictment of Rev. William Adams, D. D., against Rev. James Woodrow, D. D., dated April 17, 1886, was read in open court. This indictment contained two charges:

1st. That the said James Woodrow "did teach and promulgate that the body of Adam was probably the product of evolution from the body of some lower animal.

"2nd, That the said James Woodrow, in the publications and speeches referred to, did teach and promulgate opinions which are of a dangerous tendency, and which are calculated to unsettle the mind of the church respecting the accuracy and authority of the Holy Scriptures as an infallible rule of faith, in that he did teach and promulgate the opinion that the body of Adam was probably not made or created of the dust of the ground, as is universally understood by the church to be the declaration of the Word of God, but of organic matter preëxisting in the body of a brute." (Record and Evidence, p. 1.) Dr. Woodrow answered: "I am not guilty." (R. and E., p. 2.)

On the first specification nine votes were given to sustain the indictment, and fourteen not to sustain. On the second specification six voted to sustain and seventeen not to sustain. Dr. Adams gave notice that he would complain of this verdict to the Synod of Georgia. The complaint of Dr. Adams came before the Synod at Sparta, Ga., at the meeting of November 10-13, 1886, and was sustained by 49 votes as against 15 not to sustain, and 2 to sustain in part. The committee to prepare a minute reported "that the complaint be sustained for the reason that the finding and judgment of the Presbytery are contrary to the evidence and the law, in that the evidence before the Presbytery showed that the belief of the said defendant, James Woodrow, D. D., as to the origin of the body of Adam, was contrary to the Word of God as interpreted in the standards of the church; and it is ordered that the said verdict and judgment of the Presbytery is hereby annulled." This minute was adopted, whereupon the Rev. Dr. Woodrow gave notice that he would complain to the General Assembly of the Synod's action in the case. (R. and E. *passim*.)

We have been thus minutely exact in the foregoing statements in order that the action of the Assembly may be clearly understood, and may be seen to be absolutely final and conclusive of the case. After the adoption of the report of the majority of the Judicial Committee by the Assembly, it was moved that one hour be allowed to Dr. Woodrow for the opening speech, then one hour each to the Synod of Georgia's representatives, Drs. Adams and Strickler, (Elder J. A. Billups, the third appointee of the Synod of Georgia, being absent,) and one hour to Dr. Woodrow for the closing argument. Dr. Woodrow stated that he would need four hours, a part of the time to be used by his counsel. (He selected Judge Heiskell, of Memphis, Tenn.) The writer moved that Dr. Woodrow's request be granted. This was amended by

allowing the respondents also four hours, and then passed unanimously.

At the end of Dr. Woodrow's first two hours he seemed not to have finished what he had to say, and was allowed to proceed, no limit being assigned. On Friday night, May 25th, the argument was closed by Dr. Woodrow, and the roll was called, each member being allowed three minutes to express his views. When the clerk, taking the Synods alphabetically, had gone through the Synod of Kentucky it was voted to postpone the call of the other Synods until Saturday morning, May 26th. After the three-minute speeches were all delivered, the roll was called, and at 1:20 p. m. it was announced that thirty-four had voted to sustain, two to sustain in part, and one hundred and nine not to sustain Dr. Woodrow's complaint.

The committee appointed to bring in a paper expressing the judgment of the Assembly in the case of James Woodrow, D. D., against the Synod of Georgia, recommended the following as the judgment therein :

Whereas, The Presbytery of Augusta did find Rev. James Woodrow, D. D., not guilty of the charge preferred against him by the Rev. William Adams, D. D., wherein he was charged with preaching and formulating opinions and doctrines in conflict with the sacred Scriptures, as interpreted in our standards, the Confession of Faith, the Larger and Shorter Catechism of the Westminster Assembly; that he did, on divers occasions mentioned in said charges, teach and promulgate that the body of Adam was probably the product of evolution from the body of some lower animal; and,

Whereas, The Synod of Georgia did, upon the complaint of Rev. William Adams, D. D., annul said action of the Presbytery of Augusta, which judgment of the Synod of Georgia is brought to this General Assembly by the complaint of the Rev. James Woodrow, D. D. ;

Now, therefore, it is the judgment of this General Assembly that Adam's body was directly fashioned by Almighty God of the dust of the ground, without any natural, animal parentage of any kind. The wisdom of God prompted him to reveal the fact, while the inscrutable mode of his action therein he has not revealed. While, therefore, the church does not propose to touch, handle or conclude any question of science which belongs to God's kingdom of nature, she must by her divine constitution see that these questions are not thrust upon her to break the silence of Scripture and supplement it by any scientific hypothesis concerning the mode of God's being or acts in creation, which are inscrutable to us. It is, therefore, ordered that this complaint in this case be not sustained, and the judgment of the Synod of Georgia be, and the same is hereby in all things affirmed.

WILLIAM BROWN,	J. R. GRAHAM,
R. K. SMOOT,	S. P. GREENE,
C. A. BRIDEWELL,	A. B. CURRY.

Mr. Charles Hammond, of the Presbytery and Synod of Missouri, offered the following substitute:

Inasmuch as the action of the Synod of Georgia could not, and was not, intended to annul the verdict of the Presbytery of Augusta, by which Dr. Woodrow was acquitted of heresy, the decision of this Assembly does not affect the ministerial character or ecclesiastical standing of the complainant.

This Assembly being forbidden by the constitution of the church to handle or conclude anything but that which is ecclesiastical, does not pronounce on the scientific hypothesis which Dr. Woodrow holds as probably true, but solemnly judges that the interpretation of the scriptural account of the creation of man's body in accordance with such hypothesis is contrary to the standards of the church.

A sharp debate followed, and the vote being on the adoption of the substitute, it was lost. The report of the committee was then adopted.

THE PROTEST OF MR. WHALING.

Rev. T. C. Whaling then arose, and, advancing to a position in front of the moderator's desk, read his protest, as follows:

We whose names are undersigned do enter our solemn protest against the decision of the General Assembly refusing to sustain the complaint of the Rev. James Woodrow, D. D., against the Synod of Georgia, for the following reasons:

1. The second specification in this indictment is expressly excluded by the constitution of our church, inasmuch as "nothing ought to be considered by any court as an offence, or admitted as a matter of accusation, which cannot be proved to be such from Scripture as interpreted in the standards."

2. In the view of your protestants the Holy Bible does not reveal the form of the matter out of which, the time in which, or the mode by which, God created the body of Adam, and therefore the hypothesis of evolution as believed by Dr. Woodrow cannot be regarded in conflict with the teachings of the sacred Scriptures.

The Westminster standards simply reproduce, without interpretation, the statements of the Scriptures in reference to the creation of Adam's body, and as the views of the complainant are not in conflict with the statements of the Scriptures, so neither can they be with the teachings of the standards.

The action of the Assembly in refusing to sustain this complaint is equivalent to pronouncing as certainly false the theory of evolution as applied by Dr. Woodrow to Adam's body, which is a purely scientific question, entirely foreign to the legitimate sphere of ecclesiastical action. Your protestants, therefore, are unwilling that this General Assembly should express any opinion whatever respecting the hypothesis of evolution or any other scientific question.

T. C. Whaling, C. W. Heiskell, J. O. Lindsay, J. J. Davis, F. J. Brooke, R. Adams, J. W. Montgomery, J. O. Varnadoe, H. Wilson, G. T. Goetchius, W. N. Dickey, S. M. Neel, J. P. Fitzgerald, C. W. Robinson, J. W. Kennedy, T. B. Fraser.

The protest has sixteen signatures—about one-half the vote (thirty-four) received by Dr. Woodrow. And thus this vexed question has—

for one year, at any rate—passed beyond the consideration of the General Assembly.

REMARKS ON THE WOODROW CASE.

Every opportunity was furnished Dr. Woodrow to make good his complaint. He was not charged with heresy, but with holding and promulgating a false and dangerous opinion as to the origin of Adam's body. He was treated with kindness and consideration, and it was stated on the floor of the Assembly after his departure that he had left Baltimore with kind feelings towards the Assembly. His standing as a minister of the gospel remains intact.

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS—(*Three-Minute Speeches.*)

A very few, certainly *one* member, expressed a belief in evolution. Some thought the Bible was silent on the subject.

Some, that we ought not to cast a stigma on Dr. Woodrow.

Some revered the man, but could not adopt his teaching.

Some had no definite opinion as to whether the Bible did or did not condemn the evolution of Adam's body from some lower animal. We took notes of various opinions as uttered on the floor, but space forbids a prolix account.

The great majority held that the doctrine of the complainant was contrary to the Word of God, as interpreted in the standards of our church.

EVOLUTION IN GENERAL.

The scientific doctrine of the evolution of the various species of the lower animals by descent with modification, was not considered by the Assembly. We have room for only the briefest statement of some possible beliefs on the subject.

1st, That matter is eternal, and there is no extra mundane, personal God; that matter is endued with force, and contains in itself the potency of life and the germs of the cosmos; that this blind force acts along the lines of least resistance; that thus one species is transmuted into another in long succession; that this transmutation is gradual, and often exhibits itself by the appearance of rudimentary organs in one species, useless to that species, but developed into complete and useful organs in a succeeding species; that man is the latest product of this process, in whom force attains to consciousness and articulate utterance. This is materialistic pantheism.

2nd, That there is a personal God, who created one or more living cells, and left the forces of matter, including this new life-force, to work out their own results.

3rd, That God so started the machinery of the universe, or in some way so guides it, as to accomplish his own ends.

4th, That God may have intervened from time to time during the ages, but that such intervention is to be regarded as extraordinary, viewed with suspicion, and not admitted if we have not irresistible proof thereof.

5th, That God did certainly intervene twice, viz.: in giving a human soul to the body of Adam, and in making Eve's body out of Adam's, according to the scriptural account; but alleged previous "miraculous" interpositions are to be narrowly watched.

6th, That God has often intervened, viz.: in the production of new species, and especially of the human species. This has until recently been the exclusive theistic view, the later theistic views being relapses toward that of material pantheism. Thus Agassiz, though not a christian, pronounces the transmutation of species "a gratuitous assumption." Of the various types of lizards he says: "Having studied the facts most thoroughly, I find in them a direct proof of the creation of all these species." Again: "I find it impossible to attribute the biological phenomena which have been and still are going on upon the surface of our globe to the simple action of physical forces. I believe they are due in their entirety as well as individually to the direct intervention of a creative power, acting freely and in an autonomic way." He held also that organized beings were geographically distributed by "the direct intervention of a creative power."

Surely christian men need not stumble at the idea of the direct creation of Adam when they believe that Christ created or made out of previously existing matter, but without means or loss of time, enough bread and fish to feed five thousand men, and again four thousand men, besides women and children; also that he will at the last day re-constitute the bodies of the countless millions of the dead. "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed." Of course infidels mock at all this, but believers receive it reverently and joyfully; and if thousands of millions of bodies shall be made while the trumpet is sounding, why scruple at the production of the one human body of Adam without any descent with modification from the body of a beast?

LOGICAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE EVOLUTION OF ADAM'S BODY BY DESCENT
WITH MODIFICATION.

We may not say that an *individual* holds all the consequences that legitimately flow from his tenets; but any *theory* is responsible for all just inferences that are rightly deducible from it. To object to this is idle. We all not only may, but must, and habitually do, act on this principle in the formation and maintenance of our opinions, and in the practical conduct of life. If Adam was descended from a lower animal, it must have been by birth, and from a viviparous mammal. Then he was not born in lawful wedlock, but was the spawn of brute coition—august man, the image of God, the Son of God!

Unless we fly to some wild trichotomy, Adam consisted of soul and body. When was the soul introduced into the body? Surely before his birth. His soul was pure and holy, the abode of the Holy Spirit; and thus the first earthly temple of the Holy Ghost was the abdomen of a beast!

Let us contrast with these horrible thoughts the pure and tender accounts given by the evangelists of the conception and birth of the second Adam, echoed by the early church in the formula hallowed by ten times ten thousand lips:

“Conceived of the Holy Ghost and
Born of the Virgin Mary;”

and again in the church's shout of joy: “Thou art the King of glory, O Christ; thou art the everlasting Son of the Father. When thou tookest upon thee to deliver man, thou didst humble thyself to be born of a virgin”—words that we can hardly repeat without tears of love and wonder; for we worship thee, God of the manger and the cross, and all the bells of heaven rang when thou wast born! But if we are to accept this hypothesis as to Adam's body, we must say or sing that he was

Conceived of a male brute and
Born of a female brute,

that he might be our federal head and representative, and on the human side the progenitor of the Lord of glory!

Woe is me! On what times are we fallen?

While we find the fossil remains of the iguanodon, the pterodactyl, the ichthyosaurus and other saurians, the deinotherium and other theria, and many living specimens of chimpanzees, gorillas, etc., the link between Adam and the ape tribe is still missing. No *habeas cor-*

pus has been able to bring him, alive or dead, body or bone, into court. The scientific eye now looks to Africa, and to some other remote and geologically unexplored regions, where the missing link or his remains may lurk. Why did he demise, and yet the gorilla survive?

And the papyrus, or cylinder, or cuneiform inscription on a tablet is yet to seek which shall tell us how the babe Adam was suckled from the *distenta ubera* of his primate dam, and was dandled in her paws; how he honored his dam, and, if he ever met the gentleman, his sire too, so that his days were long in the land; how he grew in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and the anthropoids; how he acquired the habit of talking to himself from lack of human fellowship, and how, after long tutelage in a holy course of life, he sinned and fell, and thus sin entered into the world, and all our mortal woes! Can the church of God accept this hypothesis? Never. L. G. BARBOUR.

THE NORTHERN GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

THE opening of the Centennial Assembly at Philadelphia, on the 17th of May, 1888, was an imposing ceremony. The vast body formed at Horticultural Hall and marched in procession to the First Church. The able sermon of the retiring moderator was addressed to a great audience, composed of the commissioners and an overflowing multitude.

On re-assembling in the afternoon there arose an interesting contest for moderator. Many felt that the position should be given to Dr. McCosh as the crowning honor to one of the most illustrious of Presbyterians. But the choice fell on Dr. Charles L. Thompson, of Kansas City, who vindicated its wisdom by his conduct of the office.

Five hundred and twenty-two members were enrolled. This large number had two results: greater impulse was added by the weight and enthusiasm of the multitude; but, on the other hand, the value of the body as a deliberative assembly was injuriously affected. It became evident that the number must be reduced, or else that all business must be first considered in committees.

The general work of the church was found to be in a highly prosperous state. The Boards of Missions, (Home and Foreign), of Education, of Aid to Colleges, of Publication and others have made most encouraging progress. The Sabbath-school Missionary department of the Board of Publication showed marked development. In addition to its regular missionaries, more than sixty students from the Theo-

logical Seminaries have been sent out for four months' labor in the West and Northwest. The effort to raise the Million-Dollar Fund for Ministerial Relief, though not entirely successful as yet, will probably be completed in the future.

The Standing Committee on Temperance reported a resolution excluding from church membership those who manufacture or sell liquor; and with the solitary opposition of Dr. Howard Crosby, although others endeavored in vain to obtain the floor in his support, was tumultuously passed. Thus a term of communion was sought to be imposed for which there is no warrant in Scripture or the standards.

The Freedmen's Board occupied the attention of the Assembly, specially with reference to the question whether it shall remain separate or be incorporated with the Board of Home Missions. The matter lies over in the hands of a special committee.

The Committee on Bills and Overtures reported in favor of the formation of a Negro Presbytery in Virginia and its attachment to the colored Synod of Atlantic. This report was adopted without dissent by the Assembly.

Dr. John R. Paxton, in view of all the trouble we have had and are having about these children of Africa, anathematized the day they were brought from their native land to our shores. This remark was open to three interpretations—a condemnation of the slave trade, a lamentation over the insoluble problems thereby forced on America, or an oburgation of the negro. The audience, or a portion of it, put the last construction on his words, whereupon there ensued something quite astounding and incredible: a strange sound filled the air; a vibrating, penetrating, infuriating sibilation; a commissioner, formerly a soldier in the Federal army, and now the pastor of one of the great churches of New York city, was publicly and loudly *hissed* in the hall of the General Assembly. The moderator called to order, the Assembly cried shame; it was stated that the hissing did not proceed from members of the Assembly, but the contrary was also asserted. It was evident that the great body of the Assembly condemned this unreasoning method of debate; and when Dr. Paxton afterwards explained his remark as directed against the slave trade, his assailants were still further disgraced; and thus the incident ended.

The report of the Committee of Conference with the Southern Church was, after reference to a special committee, unanimously

adopted. The General Assembly declared in favor of coöperation with the other branch in all practicable methods. It added, however, that organic union is requisite in order to perfect coöperation. The desire of the great body of the Northern Church is toward organic union, and principally for the reason that the efficiency of the united churches will be increased thereby.

The energies of the Northern Church are directed toward active labors in extending the area and power of its influence. It is difficult to estimate fully the wide scope of these efforts. Too great praise cannot be accorded to the zeal and intelligence with which its great enterprises are conducted. This church believes that union with the Southern Church would secure an immense development of Presbyterianism.

The resolution on Decoration Day was an untoward incident, yet it does not possess the significance attached to it by lookers-on at a distance. It was voted down by the Assembly, and then passed in a modified form, in the hurry of the last day. As adopted, it was intended to be simply an expression of reverence for the dead and of sympathy with their families. Whatever may be its apparent political complexion, there was no purpose to make a political deliverance. The debate showed this. It is incredible that, after inviting the Southern Church to organic union, the Assembly intended to say anything which would prove to be an obstacle in the way of it. The Assembly was surprised by the sudden introduction of the resolution; all the speakers regretted it; in the confusion that followed, and in the haste of the last moments, it was difficult to do the wisest thing. It is safe to say that nothing of the kind will be permitted in the future to obtrude itself upon the Assembly. I have not met with any minister or member who does not regret that the resolution was offered, or who considers it, as adopted, to possess political significance, or who attaches any importance to it.

Knowing the view of this incident taken by some in the South, and having been present in the Assembly at the time, and having talked with many leading men since, I am bound to present the matter as it appears to the actors in it. Intention gives complexion to action; and I feel sure that there was no intention, either to insult the Southern people or to make a political deliverance.

As individuals, most of the members doubtless approved the war, but as an ecclesiastical body, nothing was further from its purpose than to rekindle its dying embers in this centennial year.

T. A. HOYT.

THE CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION IN PHILADELPHIA.

BEYOND question the most notable event of recent date, in Presbyterian circles, was the joint celebration by the two Assemblies, North and South, of the one hundredth anniversary of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in this country, which took place in Philadelphia on the twenty-fourth day of May last. In America a hundred years is a long time, and anything a hundred years old is sure to be one of the "oldest inhabitants." The country itself, as to its organized form, is scarcely older. It is a fact not without significance, as every one knows, that the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States were being framed at the same time, apparently on a common model, and were adopted the same year. It is a matter of just pride to the American Presbyterian that his church is as old as his country. All that the most ardent churchman can ask for the antiquity of his church, in any given country, is that it be as old as that country itself. Another fact which made this a notable event was, that the two great branches of the Presbyterian Church in the North and South, through their two Assemblies, looked into each other's faces, clasped hands, and joined their voices in God's praise, for the first time since their separation twenty-seven years before. This was a scene to claim the attention of men, and of which, we may suppose, the angels in heaven were not disinterested spectators. And if we cannot say with one, it was "an event unparalleled in the history of the church," we can all subscribe to the statement of the Southern Assembly, that it was "an event *seldom* paralleled in the history of the church."

A brief narration of the events of the occasion will not be out of place here. It may be said, once for all, that the completeness and perfection of the arrangements, from beginning to end, left nothing to be desired—thanks to the diligence and efficiency of the Committees of Arrangement, appointed by the two Assemblies of the previous year. From the time the Southern delegates left Baltimore (where the Assembly was in session), on Wednesday afternoon, till their return the following Friday, they were the guests of their Northern brethren, who, with a generous hospitality never surpassed, bore all the care and expense of the entire trip, which, as may be readily seen, were not inconsiderable. On Wednesday afternoon a reception was tendered the two Assemblies by Mr. and Mrs. Wistar Morris, at their beautiful villa near Overbrook, where they were also to meet President Cleveland and his

estimable wife. Here the two Assemblies met for the first time. It was a memorable scene. The Northern Assembly, being the first on the ground, formed in two lines, on each side the walk leading from the gate to the house, and between these two lines the Southern Assembly marched by twos to the mansion. They were warmly greeted and loudly cheered by their brethren, who had so deftly and generously captured them. A few hearty words of welcome from Mr. Morris were followed by a speech from Mr. Cleveland, in which he avowed and displayed his Presbyterian birth and training. After a prayer by the moderator of the Southern Assembly, the Doxology, sung by the assembled multitude, and the benediction by the moderator of the Northern Assembly, the delegates were presented to Mr. and Mrs. Cleveland, and then repaired to the bountiful repast which their generous host had with lavish hand spread for them under a large tent on the lawn.

In the evening another reception was given the two Assemblies in Philadelphia, at the Academy of Fine Arts, at which it is estimated that not less than five thousand persons were present to do honor to the occasion. The best of feeling prevailed, and many kindly greetings were exchanged. There were short speeches from Governor Beaver, of Pennsylvania; from the moderators of the two Assemblies, and from the chairmen of the Committees of Arrangement, all of which were full of the spirit of fraternity and love.

The next day (Thursday) was the Centennial Day, the "great day of the feast;" and truly it was a feast-day to mind and spirit. It is hard to see how more could possibly have been packed into one day. Twenty addresses, by an equal number of the ablest ministers and elders in the two churches, were delivered during the day. Of course it was impossible for one person to hear them all. Two of the largest audience chambers in the city—the Academy of Music and Horticultural Hall—had been secured, and each of these was filled, sometimes to overflowing, morning, afternoon and night, by the listening thousands. It is sufficient to say the speakers, their addresses and the audiences were worthy of the occasion.

A few important facts were brought prominently to notice by this joint Centennial Celebration; and perhaps the first and foremost was, that hearty good will exists between the two churches. This was evidenced by the unstinted, whole-souled hospitality of the one, and the unreserved, free acceptance of this hospitality on the part of the other. However bitter the feelings of the Northern Assembly may have been a quarter of a century ago, and however offensive the

“epithets” applied at that time to their brethren of the South, those feelings do not now exist, and those epithets do not correctly voice their sentiments at the present day. We must believe this if there is any truth in the old adage: “Actions speak louder than words,” and more especially if *present* actions speak louder than *past* words. On the other hand, it is equally evident that this good will is reciprocated by the Southern Church, or they would not, because they could not, with self-respect have accepted this generous hospitality. Such munificent favors can only be honorably accepted from friends by friends. That there are some on both sides who do not share these kindly feelings, there is little room to doubt; nevertheless it is true that among the masses of the two churches there exist sincere good-will, honest esteem, admiration and affection. This is as it should be; it is simply christian.

Another matter brought prominently to the attention of every one was the re-union of the two churches. This was necessarily so, inasmuch as the subject, in one phase of it, was then pending before both Assemblies. More than half the speeches on the occasion, including that of Mr. Cleveland at Overbrook, referred in some way to the subject of re-union, and in every case with more or less favor. At the same time there seemed to be a settled conviction on both sides that the time for re-union was not yet. The questions which now deeply interest both sides are: Will the time ever come? And if so, when? Many seem to think the time will come, and that very soon. But of that day and hour probably knoweth no man. It was noticeable how earnestly some of the speakers, especially from the business walks of life, including Mr. Cleveland, urged the civil, political and business harmony of the two sections of the country as an argument for the union of the two churches. The point of the argument seems to be, that the people of the North and South, as statesmen, politicians and business men, have buried sectional feeling and strife, and have made peace; while as christians—at least as Presbyterian christians—they refuse to do so. The argument is supposed to be unanswerable, and to place the stigma of implacability upon the churches, whose spirit should be preëminently that of forgiveness and peace. This argument would not be so frequently urged were the simple truth remembered that the churches are to-day more closely united and freer from strife and bitterness than are the political and business circles of the two sections. In proof of this, reference need only be made to scenes frequently to be witnessed in both houses of Congress,

where sectional lines are often sharply and acrimoniously drawn; or to the utterances through the press of the Northern protectionist and the Southern free-trader respecting each other. As to the churches, the utmost good-will prevails, a fact proclaimed to all the world by this very Centennial Celebration. And this is all that can possibly be claimed for the classes above named, whose peaceful dispositions have been held up as an example for the churches. True, the churches have not become one; neither have the cotton or the iron manufacturers of the North and South consolidated their interests and re-united under one management; nor is such union necessary to prove their peaceful feelings toward each other.

It should never be forgotten that, as far as the churches are concerned, there must be first a vital union, an inner oneness of spirit, thought, and sentiment on those weighty matters with which the church has to deal before organic union should be urged as desirable. Indeed, the latter is but the outward expression of the former; is worse than meaningless without it, and should always follow, never precede, it. There is many a couple who live in harmony and peace as near neighbors, but who, if joined together in a close union, would know only discord and strife. Is there now that inner oneness between the two churches that would make outward union desirable and profitable? Many on both sides think there is; very many think there is not. Let us wait till all reasonable doubt on this vital question is removed. As for the present, it is almost certain that, if the two churches had been united in one at the recent Philadelphia Assembly, when, by the resolution on Decoration Day, the issues of "the war of the Rebellion" were re-opened, and when, by the action on the records of the Synod of Oregon, the church was virtually pledged to one of the political parties of the day, there would have been feelings aroused and words uttered which would not have been for the edification of the body of Christ, nor for the honor or credit of such organic union. Let us wait for the inner oneness; "for God hath called us unto peace."

But the Centennial Celebration was grand and good. One could not but be impressed with the fact that the century just closed has left to the Presbyterian Church of this country a glorious heritage, grand opportunities, and solemn responsibilities. All seemed to appreciate this, and there were manifest an earnest spirit of inquiry as to how that heritage could best be preserved, enlarged, and transmitted to future generations, and a sincere desire to discover how the large

opportunities could be best improved and the weighty responsibilities fully met. And on all these points the Centennial Celebration was helpful, shedding additional light, giving fresh courage, and inspiring new hope; for all of which we devoutly thank our common Lord and Head.

A. B. CURRY.

SHALL THE BIBLE BE EXCLUDED FROM THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS?

In the January number of the PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY, in the notes upon "National Reform," the author asks: "Is the State to teach any religion? If religion is to be taught in the public schools, what religion shall it be?" We might answer the first question curtly, no; neither the religion of the Turk, the Hindoo nor the Christian. To the second we answer, the religion of the Bible.

After quoting from the *Christian Statesman*, the organ of the National Association, in which quotation this sentence is used, "Perceiving the subtle and persevering attempts which are made to *prohibit* the reading of the Bible in our public schools, to overthrow our Sabbath laws, etc.," the author makes this "friendly, fraternal and courteous criticism:" "The christian religion is not a proper subject of legislation. . . . The state has nothing to do with the church of God, and if called upon to protect it in any of its material interests it can only deal with it as with the Free Masons or any other human organization in society. . . . God has appointed the church to teach religion to 'every creature,' and all that the church needs to ask the State is to protect us in our property-rights as citizens, and let us alone." Now, in all due deference to the criticism of the author, we do not gather from the paragraph quoted from the *Christian Statesman* that it is the design of the National Reform Association to require the state to "teach religion" in the schools, but to urge upon the government not to *exclude* by legislative action the Bible from the subjects taught in our public schools. We do not understand the advocates of free education to demand that the state shall teach religion, but they earnestly beg that the word of God *be not excluded therefrom*. The christian may well shudder at the thought of sending his son where he cannot carry his Bible. Were the question raised to-morrow, Shall we part with the schools or the Bible? the response from every christian heart would come in thunder tones: "Away with the schools." But we do not believe that the author means either to say,

away with the Bible or away with the schools; though he appears to say let the church teach the Bible, but let the schools have nothing to do with it. Does he not go, too, a step too far, when he says, "all the church needs to ask the state is, protect us in our property-rights as citizens and let us alone?" Let the article in this same number—"State Legislation on the Christian Sabbath"—answer: "That provision in all the constitutions securing a free and untrammelled worship of God is a recognition of the fact that it is man's right and duty to worship God, and that it is competent for the state to aid its citizens in the discharge of that duty by such legislation as may be necessary to such an end." These are the words of one of the most eminent jurists of the land.

But is the church alone appointed to teach the Bible to every creature? Let Dr. Shearer in his notes "On Bible Study in College" answer. "As a text-book it is simple enough for the unlearned, profound enough for the man of genius, and absolutely free from the poison of human error. . . . Lay the mortar when you lay the brick; it unifies the whole and makes an enduring structure. So is the study of revelation and nature together. . . . An absolutely godless education will make devils and not saints. The soul grows like the body, by what it feeds upon. Feed upon carnal food and the spirit dies."

If this be so, can a christian parent consent that his child be trained where the Bible is never taught, at a period when the mind is pliant and plastic and more susceptible of impression than at any other time of life? Would he train him in any business, board him in any family or locate him in any place, where it is positively understood that the Bible shall never be opened? Surely, then, he would not train him in any school where the Bible is never read, and where prayer is never made.

But it is asked, what religion shall be taught? We have already answered: the religion of the Bible, because the religion of the Bible is that which christian people desire shall not be excluded from the schools. But we go further. In this country a constitutional majority governs. If the population of Virginia consisted chiefly of Mohammedans, could you expect to exclude from their schools the Koran? If of Chinese, the philosophy of Confucius? If of Persians, the teachings of Zoroaster? If of christians, ought the state to exclude the Bible? Now, while the christian people have the opportunity, let them urge the state not to exclude the Bible from the schools, but introduce it and keep it there, instil its truths into the minds of the children, and

we need not fear the Parsee, the Hindoo, or the Mussulman. Banish it, and scepticism and infidelity will soon reign supreme in the land, in godless deformity. Hear what the writer of notes on "Personal Liberty" says: "Socialism, anarchism, Romanism, saloonism, political corruption, and kindred evils can be relieved only by organized applied christianity."

Then, wherever there are christian officers, christian teachers and christian parents, let them apply it with all the earnestness of their souls. Let them plead with the state not to exclude the Bible from the school-room. Though an earnest advocate of free education, anxious to see it made compulsory between the ages of seven and thirteen, yet, we say, God forbid that our christian people should ever give their suffrages for a system of education into which the strong arm of the state forbids the introduction of that book which is "*the light and the life of the world.*"

THOMAS E. BARKSDALE.

VII. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

MANLY'S BIBLE DOCTRINE OF INSPIRATION.

THE BIBLE DOCTRINE OF INSPIRATION EXPLAINED AND VINDICATED. *By Basil Manly, D. D., LL. D., Professor in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.* New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway. 1888.

This book is as sound as a dollar; and sound books are, alas, becoming somewhat rare, particularly as regards the inspiration of the Scriptures. The soundness and ability of Dr. Manly's book might have been asserted in advance from what one knows of Dr. Manly himself. Dr. Manly is sound, but Dr. Manly does not go to the extreme of defending the Mechanical theory, which, in fact, so far as we are aware, has been abandoned everywhere. The compact volume before us advocates the doctrine of the divine plenary inspiration of the sacred writings, and maintains that they are not only completely and thoroughly divine, but also completely and thoroughly human; while he holds that they are exempt from much human frailty, and are in no degree tainted with human error.

The author of this valuable and opportune treatise agrees with those who hold that the Bible contains the word of God, and that not merely in the sense that the Bible *includes*, or *envelopes*, the word of God, but also in the sense that the Bible (as defined and circumscribed by the Protestant churches) *is* the word of God. The inspiration asserted is thus not merely an act of God terminating upon the souls of certain men, but also a divine product that manifested itself in their spoken and is perpetuated in their written words.

The learned author shows an extensive and very competent knowledge of the literature of his subject. All the erroneous or inadequate views are fairly stated and elucidated, and then impartially examined and calmly condemned. We do not remember that Dr. Manly adopts in terms the orthodox form of the Dynamical theory, but he does so to all intents and purposes; indeed, no one can do otherwise who is orthodox and at the same time rejects the Mechanical hypothesis. Our author (like his predecessors, William Lee, Gaussen, Tayler Lewis, Bannerman, *et al.*) carefully distinguishes between the inspiration of divine infallibility, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the inspiration of ordinary literary genius or the inspiration of ordinary spiritual illumination. He holds, as against such writers as Parker and Morell, that the difference in question is not simply one of *degree*, but one of *kind*. Lee concedes too much in allowing to the adversary that the inspiration of the sacred writers may not have differed *generically*, but only *specifically*, from the illumination of ordinary believers. Lee is, nevertheless, exactly right in his main idea upon this point. Bannerman goes so far as to declare the inspiration of the men of God to have been *miraculous*. Such a statement, of course, puts one's orthodoxy beyond question. It is largely an affair of definition. Inspiration

was no *technical* miracle, but was strictly analogous to the miracle of grace, with which, however, it is by no means to be identified. As in the work of grace, so here man coöperated with God; man put forth his faculties and accomplished a certain result, freely and characteristically; but it was God that wrought in him "both to will and to do of his good pleasure." In both cases God's work is (or was) mysterious, inscrutable, supernatural, exceptional, extraordinary; but in the case of inspiration the work was exceptional and extraordinary, not only as regards the collective mass of human beings, but also as regards the collective mass of true believers, and as regards the successive ages of church history.

Doctor Manly, once more following Lee and Bannerman, draws a sharp and radical distinction between inspiration and revelation. Bannerman and Lee have fallen at loggerheads in reference to the extent of revelation, Bannerman holding, and Lee denying, that whatever the sacred writers tell us by inspiration was equally a matter of *revelation* to them. It is very much the story over again of the two doughty knights and the shield of gold and silver. Bannerman takes strong and masterly ground when he contends that the relation between God and his inspired messengers is, in one view of it, essentially that of an employer and an errand boy. The whole message in the case, adduced by way of illustration, is that of the employer, and must be made known as such to the errand boy, and conveyed as such by the errand boy to the person to whom it was originally sent. Just so the whole message of the Bible was God's message, and as such was made known (or *revealed*) to the inspired men, and through them to mankind in general. This is just and of vital importance, and is a point that has been too much lost sight of in the sound but rather vague statements of former writers. It is not enough to say that the Bible is *true*. A book may be true from beginning to end and yet not be infallible. Examples of such books are furnished by the Elements of Euclid and the Principia of Newton; possibly also by the First Book of Maccabees, or even by the lucubrations of the Son of Sirach. It is furthermore conceivable that a book might be throughout infallible and yet not be in any part of it a divine revelation; that is to say, it is within the bounds of rational conjecture that God might make certain men infallible in all that they should aver on any subject, and then leave them to aver anything that they pleased. In such a case the utterances of the men would not any of them be a revelation from God.

The orthodox writers before Lee and Bannerman were sometimes careless in their statements upon this point. To say that the inspired writers were the recipients of a supernatural influence which made them infallible is consequently an insufficient account of the matter. In order to a complete statement it is necessary to maintain, with Lee, that the inspired writers were the recipients of a supernatural influence which made them the infallible spokesmen of Jehovah. This last statement covers the whole ground; and it is substantially identical with the statement that the whole Bible is a revelation from God. This is Bannerman's most important contention, who even goes so far as to affirm (merely in this sense, however,) the fact of a "*plenary* revelation." Lee, on the other hand, looking at the matter from another angle, urges that a "*plenary revelation*" would involve the omniscience of the human messengers. The truth is, there are two senses in which the term "revelation" may be used, the one narrow and technical, the other broad and popular. In the first of these two senses, it is contrary to the fact to allege that

every part of Scripture is strictly a "revelation," albeit the whole Bible is equally inspired. In the second of the two senses of the word, it is fundamentally important to enounce that the entire mass of the Scriptures, and every part and parcel of them, are equally and to the fullest extent, to borrow Dr. W. H. Harper's favorite expression, "God-given," a supernatural revelation from the author and fountain-head of divine truth. By "revelation" in the narrow and technical sense is meant the supernatural communication of matter previously unknown, and often, if not always, unknowable, to prophets and inspired teachers. When the term is taken in this way the distinction is sharply drawn betwixt "revelation" and inspiration. In the other use of the term "revelation" that distinction is disregarded. Bannerman appears to have confounded these two meanings of the same word, and, because he perceives so clearly the fact and prime importance of a revelation from God that shall be coextensive with God's entire message to mankind, has jumped to the conclusion that this revelation must always be distinct from inspiration, and has failed to observe that the necessity in question does not involve anything more than is embraced in the doctrine of "*plenary inspiration*" when properly defined—as it is defined by Dr. Lee. Bannerman is so erect that he leans backwards. He actually contends that Luke must have had a special revelation of the fact that Paul stood on Mars' Hill, and that he himself sailed with him on the Mediterranean. Dr. Manly explicitly protests against this extreme, and agrees with the late Dr. Archibald Alexander, both the Hodges, Dr. Lee, and the majority of older and contemporary writers, in holding that much of the matter infallibly and divinely communicated to us in God's Word was accessible to the unassisted powers of the human instruments, and, in many cases, actually within their knowledge. It was inspiration, and not a special "revelation," that converted a part of what was already known to the holy men into God's infallible message to the world. Bannerman argues ingeniously and impressively from the acknowledged duplication of much of the same essential teaching that is given us in natural, in "revealed" religion. On the whole, however, as has been pointed out, this view is extreme and unnecessary. Yet it must not be forgotten that a large, and that the most important part, of the matter communicated to us in the Scriptures demanded a supernatural "revelation" in the strictest sense, and was originally given in that mode, although equally with the matter not thus given the product of divine inspiration.

The specific difference between "revelation" and inspiration, when the distinction is made, is that revelation is the supernatural influence which communicated to the recipients truth before unknown to them and undiscoverable by their unaided faculties; whereas inspiration is the supernatural influence which enabled the recipients to convey God's message, whether naturally or supernaturally communicated to them, infallibly to the rest of mankind. Dr. Lee's principal claim upon our admiration is the skill and accuracy with which he has indicated and maintained this fundamental line of demarcation. Dr. Manly is as clear as a bell on this point.

In the two hundred and fifty odd pages of this neat duodecimo all branches of the subject are presented in an orderly manner, and handled with perspicuity and force. We suspect that in one or two instances a better analysis would have grouped what are now separated points under a common parental head. The first chapter

is preliminary. Then come distinctions and explanations, followed by a summary of the most influential views now prevalent. The two remaining chapters of this, the first part of the discussion, are made up of the negative and positive statements of the doctrine. The second part is taken up with the proofs of inspiration. These are comprised in three chapters: on the Presumptive Argument, the Direct Evidence to be expected, and the Downright Proofs. It has escaped us if our excellent author has adverted to the undoubted weight of what we may style the *psychological* argument for verbal inspiration. The third part is devoted to the objections. Here, as also in the second part, there is discernible a certain air of strait quarters—probably due to unavoidable curtailment. More prominence might have been given to the fundamental challenge of Fichte and Morell. H. C. ALEXANDER.

INSPIRATION CONFERENCE PAPERS.

THE INSPIRED WORD. A Series of Papers and Addresses Delivered at the Bible-Inspiration Conference, Philadelphia, 1887. *Edited by Arthur T. Pierson.* 8vo., pp, 358. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Company. Price, \$1.50.

In May, 1887, a circular letter was issued, opening as follows:

It has been decided to hold a Conference in Philadelphia, November 15–20, on the subject of *The Plenary Inspiration of the Scriptures*.

Irreverent sceptics persistently attack the foundations of our most holy religion, while professing friends of christianity are doing incalculable injury through their adverse criticisms on the Bible. Thus timid disciples become discouraged, many of whom make shipwreck; while the army of doubters increases on every hand. Such a conference is needed in order to confirm the faith of christian believers in the canon of Holy Scripture, which, in its original languages, has been held by the church in all ages as the product of the Holy Spirit in all its parts and terms. Men of God spake and wrote as they were moved by the Divine Spirit. . .

This call was signed by a committee of influential representatives of several evangelical churches, of which committee Rt. Rev. William R. Nicholson, of the Reformed Episcopal Church, was chairman.

Of all the many and varied religious conferences and conventions which have become such a characteristic feature of the last decade we recall none which enlisted our interest so heartily as did this; and it was with peculiar gratification that we read the announcement of the publication of the various papers read, the volume to issue from the sterling old firm, A. D. F. Randolph & Co., under the editorial supervision of Rev. Arthur T. Pierson, D. D.

The book contains seventeen addresses, delivered by as many different speakers, some of whose names are of national fame and others presumably prominent in the leading denominations: the Methodist, Baptist, Episcopal, Congregational and Presbyterian. The topics discussed are: Questions Concerning Inspiration; The Relation of the Gospels and the Pentateuch; The Testimony of the Scripture to Itself; Bible Miracles; Principles of Interpretation; Alleged Objections to Inspiration Considered; Theories of Inspiration; Difficulties of the Bible as Tested by the Laws of Evidence; The Testimony of the Apostles to Inspiration; The Wonderful Book; The Bearing of Prophecy on Inspiration; Jesus the Supreme Witness and Example of Inspiration; The Moral Glory of Jesus a Proof of Inspiration; The Canon of Scripture; Preach the Word; The Spirit and the Word; The Organic Unity of the Bible.

Readers will recognize in this list a very appetizing bill of fare. We think a very interesting and effective address might have been added, as introductory to the whole discussion, treating some such topic as *The à priori Probability of a Divine Revelation*. Establish the fact that the character of God and the needs of man, considered under the light derived from the analogy of God's dealings in the world of nature, create a strong presumption in favor of a revelation in the realm of grace, and you enter the argument proper for inspiration with immense momentum.

The volume is a very acceptable one, and we doubt not will prove useful. It is, in our judgment, an eminently *timely* discussion. A little analysis and reflection will convince even a careless reader of our current literature that the attack along the whole line of scepticism, unbelief and misbelief is upon the doctrine of inspiration; occasionally the assault is a direct charge, oftener it is a flank movement; sometimes it more nearly resembles a feint, but directly or indirectly, expressly or implicitly, immediately or inferentially, the point assailed is inspiration. We believe the time has come for the unequivocal statement of the doctrine in its original integrity, for the clear exposition of it, for the uncompromising enforcement of it, for an insistent emphasis of its essential importance. It is the citadel of our faith, and we sometimes fear that while defenders of the faith are manning the ramparts to resist the tumultuous demonstration against the outworks, the miners are secretly sapping the very foundations.

In addition to its timeliness, its sound conservatism is greatly to be commended. We have nothing new or original here; no exploitation of ingenious speculation nor plausible theory, no elastic accommodation to the demands of an insidious infidelity masquerading under the guise of advanced thought. It is the same old doctrine that has proven the sheet-anchor to an authoritative standard of religious belief and the inspiration to holy living; at once the infallible guide of both creed and deed. Reading it after the perusal of so much "advanced thought" is like emerging from the stifling atmosphere of a cave, murky with miners' lamps, into the bracing air of God's heaven with the sun riding in its strength.

Of course a volume composed of contributions from so many different minds, together with obvious advantages, will exhibit inevitable disadvantages; there must of necessity be no little inequality in the papers, and decided differences in modes of thought and style will give rise to an apparent lack of unity. At the same time it is reasonable to suppose that few minds are so comprehensive in culture and uniform in ability as to compass the advantage attainable from a wise selection of contributors. For a course of popular lectures the ability is all that need be desired, and the style is generally very good, with the exception of one address, which would have been improved by the cultivation of a severer simplicity.

We must dissent from the claim of inspiration for the Hebrew points; the evidence to the contrary has always seemed to us overwhelming. The address on the Canon might have done good service, in the present stage of Biblical criticism, by laying very special emphasis on the critical spirit engaged in the formation of the Canon. One of the latest assumptions of the modern school is that this science is a birth of the nineteenth century, the urgent exigent duty of which is to revise the ready conclusions of a thoughtless, credulous age, in which almost any claimant for a place in the Canon found easy acceptance.

A careful reading of the work convinces us that, on the whole, there is as much to commend and as little to disapprove as in any book we have read in many a day. We will be glad to hear of its wide circulation. SAMUEL M. SMITH.

DRS. HODGE'S THEOLOGY OF THE SHORTER CATECHISM.

THE SYSTEM OF THEOLOGY CONTAINED IN THE WESTMINSTER SHORTER CATECHISM OPENED AND EXPLAINED. *By the Rev. A. A. Hodge, D. D., and the Rev. J. Aspinwall Hodge, D. D.* New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1888. 12mo, pp. 190.

Here is a comprehensive little volume of far more value than its small size would lead one to expect. It is undoubtedly the best succinct exposition of the matter of the Shorter Catechism in existence; and, having been prepared with a view to the needs of lay students of the theology of our standards, it challenges the study of our Sabbath-school teachers, elders, and educated laity, as well as that of the clergy. The names of its authors are of sweet savour in all the churches, the one as one of the most honored of the teachers of our doctrine, the other as one of the most able of the teachers of our polity to the present generation. The late Dr. A. A. Hodge had finished the dogmatic portion (through Question 39) before he was called to his rest, and his kinsman, as a labor of love, has worthily completed the book, which is now issued at a price (one dollar) which brings it within the reach of all. The skill with which the booklet has been prepared is the result of the long preparation which Dr. A. A. Hodge necessarily obtained in summarizing this same doctrine in his "Outlines of Theology," and his "Commentary on the Confession of Faith," and popularizing it in his "Popular Lectures on Theological Themes." That Dr. Aspinwall Hodge's supplement retains the high level set by the earlier half of the book is a proof of the persistence of good blood. No Presbyterian ought to permit himself to be without this admirable aid to his understanding of the best catechism ever framed. B. B. WARFIELD.

PRESSENSE'S ANCIENT WORLD AND CHRISTIANITY.

THE ANCIENT WORLD AND CHRISTIANITY. *By E. De Pressensé, D. D., author of "The Early Years of Christianity," "A Study of Origins," etc.* Translated by Annie Harwood Holmden. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1888. Octavo, pp. xxxi., 479.

Just thirty years ago M. De Pressensé published the first edition of his "Histoires des trois premiers siècles de l'église," to which was prefixed a very long Introduction. This Introduction was, in 1861, translated into English, and issued from the press of the Clarks, in Edinburgh, as an octavo volume of 264 pages, under the title of "The Religions Before Christ: being an Introduction to the First Three Centuries of the Church." It is this volume, in an enlarged form, which lies before us. There is no allusion, either in the preface or the body of the work, to this fact that it is an old book in a new dress. The explanation of this is to be found, we suppose, in the fact that the book has been entirely rewritten. Although little has been added to the argument it contains, yet the exposition of the several religious systems which preceded christianity has been so enlarged as to cover twice the number of pages. It should be mentioned also that the chapter on Judaism, contained in the first edition, has, in this, been reduced to the dimensions of a few paragraphs. The fuller treatment here was rendered unnecessary by the incorpor-

ation of the substance of the chapter in the author's "Jesus Christ: His Times, Life, and Work."

Like all M. De Pressensé's books, the present work is fascinating on account of the charming style. Yet we are not sure that the author does not too often yield to the temptation, which easily besets him, to be eloquent. At times there is danger that the rhetoric may divert the reader's attention from the argument, and prevent his carrying away the best results from the perusal of the book.

The object of the volume is to show that man, since he is essentially a religious being, cannot rest out of communion with God; and yet, left to himself, he will never attain to a true knowledge of God, or discover a method satisfactory to himself by which he may come into fellowship with God; that the result of all his efforts is, therefore, to lead him, in despair of all other help, to look for a direct intervention of heaven, and prepare him to accept christianity.

That man is essentially a religious being, and that religious sentiment cannot be regarded as a mere outward communication to him, but is "an intuitive and spontaneous development of his nature" causing him to "turn instinctively to the Divine as the magnet to the pole," the author takes for granted here, having given it full consideration in his "Study of Origins." Yet the review he makes of the various religions which have preceded christianity offers abundant corroborative evidence that it is as natural for man to worship as it is for him to breathe. The irreligion of multitudes of individuals is no more disproof of the one than are the phenomena of asphyxy of the other. The discussion of the great historic religions of the ancient world is embraced in five books, with subdivisions into chapters, as follows:

BOOK I.—THE ANCIENT EAST.

- CHAPTER I. *The Starting-Point of the Religious Evolution.*
- CHAPTER II. *Chaldeo-Assyrian Religion.*
- CHAPTER III. *The Religion of Egypt.*
- CHAPTER IV. *The Religion of Phœnicia.*

BOOK II.—THE RELIGIOUS DEVELOPMENT OF THE ORIENTAL ARYANS.

- CHAPTER I. *The Primitive Aryans.*
- CHAPTER II. *The Religion of Zoroaster.*

BOOK III.—THE RELIGIONS OF INDIA.

- CHAPTER I. *The Religion of the Vedas.*
- CHAPTER II. *Transformation of the Religion of the Vedas after the Settlement of the Vedic Aryans on the Banks of the Ganges.*
- CHAPTER III. *Buddha.*

BOOK IV.—HELLENIC PAGANISM.

- CHAPTER I. *Its First Period.*
- CHAPTER II. *The Religion of Greece in its Full Development.*
- CHAPTER III. *Greek Philosophy.*

BOOK V.—GRECO-ROMAN PAGANISM AND ITS DECLINE.

- CHAPTER I. *Change that Passed over Ancient Paganism, from the Time of Alexander and Under the Romans.*
- CHAPTER II. *The Pagan World at the Coming of Christ.*

All these religions, our author finds, are essentially the worship of nature. The earliest and lowest form is a sort of indistinct and undeveloped pantheism which is born of the overwhelming impression made by the splendor of nature and the resistless power which everywhere manifests itself. The next step is to supplement this elementary naturism by what our author calls "animism or spiritism, which is a sort of primitive philosophy, the belief that there is a soul or spirit informing all the phenomena of nature."

When this stage had been reached, the progress to polytheism in all its forms was easy. Fetichism is the lowest phase of it, which is the belief that in certain lifeless material objects there reside spiritual beings endowed with supernatural powers. The worship of animals is only a step in advance, but is based upon the same conception. "The worship of the stars [also] was at first a mere extension of fetichism—an idealized fetichism in this sense, that the stars were regarded as the highest manifestation and incorporation of the Divine, which was still essentially a spirit, the immaterial element enshrined in a sensible form" (p. 17.)

In Greece, we find the culmination of this development of polytheism. The time came when men began to regard these various natural objects as symbols of the powerful beings who were worshipped under their names. This was due to the fact that the primitive animism had now been supplemented by anthropomorphism. The spirits which animated sun, moon, stars, the ocean, rivers, etc., were conceived as *persons* like men; as subject to the law of the sexes; as moved by love, hate, and the other passions which characterize men. All this implied that they possessed human bodies, as the appropriate instruments and vehicles of these human passions and appetites. The gods were then but men. To the Greek, the highest objects of worship were beings exalted above ordinary men, yet still only men. Says M. De Pressensé, in another of his books:

"Naturalism as it touches the shores of Greece undergoes a transformation; we see it narrowing and contracting its vague horizon lines, as it touches that wondrous land, which seems in its very natural conformation the worthy amphitheatre prepared for heroic conflicts. The idea of symmetrical beauty breathes in its pure harmonious lines, which stand out in all their clearness of perspective in the tender light. It is there, on the shores of that sea of countless creeks, under that heaven brilliant but never burning, that man awakes to know himself as more beautiful, more mighty than the outer world, and makes gods in his own likeness. In place of engulfing himself in an absorbing vortex of deity, he seeks to find *himself* in the object of his adoration; he carves his own idealized image in the marble, and this is his god. The heroic age had lifted him above himself; the god was only the hero placed upon the altar. The Hellenes worshipped themselves in the ravishing types of marvellous beauty. Thus Greece opposes the apotheosis of the heroic to the Indian incarnations, and solves the religious problem in a directly inverse manner, for instead of absorbing the finite in the infinite, she enshrines the divine in a fair but finite form."—(*Jesus Christ, His Times, Life, and Work*, pp. 41, 42.)

The original naturism has only taken upon it another form; we have here, as in the beginning of the development, the worship of the creature instead of the creator.

Although this be true, however, we must not allow it to escape us that, throughout all this period, there is a sort of undertone which proclaims a semi-conscious belief in monotheism. The pantheism of the Brahman, and the misnamed nihilism—the doctrine of Nirvana and Karma—of the Buddhist, cannot be explained except by reference to this tendency to believe in one God. In the poems of Homer this conviction is to be recognized.

"Homer acknowledges a Zeus greater than the vindictive and capricious husband of Juno, a supreme God, Lord of heaven and earth—the God whose power there is no resisting. 'All Olympus trembles at his nod;'" p. 285. In the incomparable tragedies of Æschylus and Sophocles, the idea which dominates every other is that there is a power above man, above the gods of Olympus, which guards with jealous watchfulness the cause of right, and punishes wrong in spite of every effort to avert the penalty. Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, are all monotheists. It was only a question of time that the teaching of poets and philosophers should undermine the popular belief in the gods many. Then came the period of scepticism, for the one god of the poets and the philosophers was an abstraction. The results of this scepticism manifest themselves most distinctly in the Greco-Roman period. The circle was complete. Man had trodden it all the way around. He must have a God, and yet he has found none to fill his empty soul. The time was ripe. Heaven heard the despairing cry of humanity. Jesus of Nazareth was born, and the world had a Saviour.

We close with M. De Pressensé's closing words:

"The Deliverer is at length come! He for whom the old Chaldean was yearning, when, with terror-stricken conscience, he used the incantation to his seven demons, and weeping for his sins, called upon a God whom he knew not. The Deliverer is come! whom Egypt dimly foresaw when she spoke in words which she understood not, of a God who was wounded in all the wounds of His creatures. The Deliverer is come! for whom the magi of Iran strained their eyes, looking for a Saviour greater than Zoroaster. The Deliverer is come! for whom the India of the Vedas panted when she was lifted for a moment above her pantheism by the intuition of a Holy God; one who could satisfy the burning thirst for pardon, which none of the springs of her own religion would avail to quench. The Deliverer is come! the true Son of God, who alone can lead mankind to battle with full assurance of victory; the God whose image, dimly discerned, had floated in fantastic incarnations through the waking dreams of the Brahman. The Deliverer is come! He who can have compassion on the sufferer and on all who are desolate and oppressed, without plunging Himself and the whole world into the Buddhist sea of annihilation. The Deliverer is come! He whom Greece had prefigured at Delphi and Eleusis—the God who saves because He also has suffered. The Deliverer is come! He who was foretold and foreshadowed by the holy religion of Judea, which was designed to free from every impure element the universal aspiration of mankind. He has come to obey, to love, to die, and, by dying, to save.

"Whether men will have it so or no, the cross of Christ divides two worlds, and forms the great landmark of history. It interprets all the past; it embraces all the future; and however fierce the conflict waged around it, it still is, and shall be through all the ages, the symbol of victory." Pp. 469, 470.

JAMES F. LATIMER.

SCHAFF'S CHURCH AND STATE.

CHURCH AND STATE IN THE UNITED STATES; Or, the American Idea of Religious Liberty and its Practical Effects. With Official Documents. *By Philip Schaff, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary at New York.* Reprinted from the Papers of the American Historical Association, Vol. II., No. 4. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1888. 8vo., pp. 161. With Appendix.

Dr. Schaff is well known both as a professor and as an author. In this little book he has given to the public, in an expanded form, his inaugural address, delivered September 22, 1887, at his induction into his present professorship.

The subject discussed is one about which every American citizen ought to be informed, especially in this critical and formative period of our history. If false principles are allowed to crystallize within our civilization, nothing short of a revolution will ever eradicate them. True conceptions of the relations of the church to God and to man, of the relations of the state to God and to man, and of their relations to each other, would have saved the world from the terrible apostasies, the inhuman persecutions, and many of the most bloody wars, which have disgraced its history. The world has never reached a satisfactory conclusion as to what are the relations that ought to exist between the church and the state. The question is an exceedingly difficult one. The difficulty lies principally in the fact that the world has never satisfactorily determined the relations that ought to exist between the church and God and between the church and man on the one hand, and between the state and God and the state and man on the other. These questions must be determined before it is possible to reach a conclusion as to the relations that ought to exist between them. Discussions on this subject are, therefore, timely.

Dr. Schaff has not gone at length into an inquiry of what were the fundamental grounds of these relations, but has contented himself with assuming, in great measure, that the position of our government is the correct one, and giving a history of what already exists, with his conception of its practical effects. In this particular his book is valuable. He traces the religious legislation of our central government, gives the opinions of leading statesmen upon that legislation, and the interpretations put upon it by our supreme court. His comparison of the American idea of church and state with that of the various European governments is both interesting and valuable. The principal effects signalized as having been produced by this idea are, the removal of Erastianism from our creeds and the making religious persecution by the state impossible.

Upon several points we do not agree with the author, but as all the points upon which we differ result from our disagreement upon two fundamental positions, we will only notice those two.

1. He contends that "civil government belongs to the kingdom of the Father, not of the Son." Where he gets his authority for such a position we are at a loss to know. Surely not from the Scriptures. The prophets and the apostles concur in representing Christ as the mediatorial King, having *all* government committed to him. The passages in the Old Testament which prove this are too numerous even to refer to. One or two will answer our purpose. "But they shall serve the Lord their God, and David their king, whom I will raise up unto them." (Jer. xxx. 9.) "And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a prince among them; I the Lord have spoken it." (Ezek. xxxiv. 24.) The Jews were right in supposing that their Messiah would be the head of all temporal governments. They were wrong in supposing that he would exercise that government from an earthly throne. They were also wrong in failing to perceive that, along with his temporal dominion, he would have a spiritual kingdom. The New Testament is equally explicit. "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet." (1 Cor. xv. 24, 25.) "Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him." (Heb. ii. 8.) "And he hath on his ves-

ture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS." (Rev. xix. 16.) Our government, as the author shows, has deliberately refused to acknowledge this relation to its King. The effects of that decision are known only to that King whose majesty we have affronted.

2. The author says: "The church is instituted for the religious interests and eternal welfare of man; the state for his secular interests and temporal welfare." He also regards them as inseparable, yet distinct. Then again he says: "A total separation of church and state is an impossibility, unless we cease to be a christian people." He cites as proof marriage, the Sabbath, and public schools. We admit that *religion* and the state ought not to be separated. The state ought to be a religious institution, but the separation of *church* and state ought to be absolute. In the mediatorial crown is vested the dominion of two great empires, one spiritual, the other non-spiritual. All men ought to be subjects of both. The primary end of each should be the secondary end of the other. Each should acknowledge Jesus as its King, and the source of its authority, and as such should pay him honor and worship. Each should have marriage, the Sabbath, and all the other precepts of the moral law, as embraced in the ten commandments, as a part of its statute law. Each should inflict its own penalties upon its own subjects in case of an infraction of law, one spiritual, the other non-spiritual. While, therefore, they ought to have the same religion—we use this term as meaning Protestantism—and, in many instances, the same laws, yet they ought to be so completely separated that neither could in any way interfere with the administration of the other. There is only one point of connexion, and that is in the source from which they both derive their authority, the mediatorial crown of their common sovereign.

G. A. BLACKBURN.

PUNGER'S HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION.

HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION FROM THE REFORMATION TO KANT. *By Bernhard Pünjer. Translated from the German by W. Hastie, B. D. With a Preface by Robert Flint, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Divinity, University of Edinburgh.* Octavo, pp. xix., 660. New York: Scribner & Wellford. 1887.

The title of this book might suggest that the author designed to confine himself to the consideration of the philosophy of religion as conceived from the point of view of the christian. But this is, by no means, the case, as a mere glance at the table of contents shows. Fully one-third of the volume is devoted to a presentation of the views of the English deists, Des Cartes and Spinoza, the French sceptics of the eighteenth century, and the representatives of the German *Aufklärung* or period of illuminism.

At first sight, it is somewhat difficult to see what place the speculations of Spinoza, for instance, or of Hume, or Voltaire, have in a History of the *Christian* Philosophy of Religion. But the careful student of Professor Pünjer's book will discover that there are at least two good reasons for the course he has pursued. The first is that, however anti-christian was the attitude of these thinkers, their systems were genetically related to the entire movement of philosophical thinking of the times and countries in which they lived. Philosophical systems, no matter how

considerable the element may be of individuality infused into them by their authors, are never spun *entirely* out of the brains of those whose names they bear. Every thinker, even the most original, is, in great measure, the creature of the age in which he lives; and the character of his speculations is what it is largely because of the tendencies of thought which predominate about him. And as others contribute their share to make him what he is, so must he contribute his share to the influences which shall become apparent in the thinking of those who follow him. To understand, then, the *Christian Philosophy of Religion*, it is necessary to become familiar with the entire course of speculation upon the subject of religion within the sphere of the development of that Christian Philosophy. An adequate presentation of the opinions of christian thinkers, therefore, required that these systems so closely connected with those opinions both as causes and effects should be fully set forth.

The second consideration, which justifies the large degree of attention given by our author to these speculations of deists and infidels, is the fact that the task he has set himself is really nothing else than to write the history of one phase of apologetics. The questions as to the sources of religious knowledge and the validity of reason in matters of faith being the problems of the Christian Philosophy of Religion, are also the fundamental problems of apologetics. Whether there be any christian religion or not depends upon the solution given to these problems. A system of Christian Philosophy of Religion is really a vindication of our revealed religion against the attacks of those who either deny the possibility of supernatural revelation, or exalt reason to such supremacy in matters of religion as makes the transcendent element in christianity of no effect. The historian of the Christian Philosophy of Religion must take account of both sides of this debate. It is impossible to make intelligible the defence without setting forth clearly the principles and arguments of the attacking party; and this is just what Professor Pünjer is doing in the extensive and luminous exposition which he gives of Hume's Philosophy, and in the briefer sketches of the views of the French Encyclopedists and of the German rationalists.

One of the most interesting and instructive portions of the volume is that devoted to "The Doctrines of the Reformers." All students of theology are familiar with the differences of Lutherans and the Reformed on the subject of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and the fatal results of the dissensions between the two parties which lost to Protestantism the completeness of its triumph in Europe. But nowhere, so far as we are aware, is the *rationale* of that conflict so clearly and succinctly set forth as in Prof. Pünjer's pages. It is found in the fundamental difference of the parties as to the place of reason in matters of religion. Luther "drives reason entirely out of the sphere of religious knowledge with the lash of his heavy scourge, while, at the same time, he lauds it as the highest gift of God in the sphere of secular insight."

Says our author, in commenting on Luther's views concerning the spiritual and the secular spheres:

"The distinction of these two spheres gives the deeper foundation of the proposition that something may be true in theology which is untrue in philosophy, and conversely. This is the assertion of a 'double truth.' Against the condemnation of the double truth by the Sorbonne, Luther emphatically maintains that view. The proposition that the Word was made flesh is true in theology, whereas in philosophy

it is absolutely impossible and absurd. So, in like manner, the inference that as the whole divine essence belongs to the Father, and the whole divine essence belongs to the Son, therefore the Son is the Father, is entirely correct in philosophy, whereas in theology it is completely untrue. If, then, a philosophical proposition comes too close to an expression of the Scriptures, it just means *mulier taceat in ecclesia*. To assert only one truth is as much as to say that 'the truths of faith are to be reduced under the yoke of human reason;' it is the same as 'wishing to enclose the heavens and the earth in their own centre, and putting them into a pepper-corn.'" (Pp. 129, 130.)

The legitimate outcome of this is that it is of no weight to urge against any alleged doctrine of revelation that it is a contradiction to the plain principles of common sense, or the facts given by observation. From this it follows that, in interpreting the Scriptures, we are not to be deterred from accepting any proposition which the language taken literally would legitimate, simply because reason pronounces it a contradiction to some truth which it establishes.

"The Calvinistic theologians," on the other hand, "claim for reason the right of deciding on contradictions in any theological questions, and not merely in those questions which can be understood even by the natural reason, but also in matters which are purely mystical. All the reasons that are advanced for this position may be reduced to this one, that error is contained in every contradiction, and therefore no truth of faith can contain a contradiction. While the Calvinists restrict themselves to this position, they emphatically repudiate the accusation of the Lutherans that they elevate philosophy to be the mistress and judge in matters of faith." (Pp. 166, 167.)

It is evident that the Calvinists meant to give to reason only a *negative* function "in matters purely mystical," to use our author's phrase. Nothing can be true which contradicts reason, and therefore reason can always decide, in case of a contradiction, that the proposition which contains it is false. But reason can never declare the doctrine of the Incarnation or of the Trinity false, because, when properly stated, they contain no contradiction. But reason does reject the doctrine of the ubiquity of Christ's humanity involved in the Lutheran doctrine of the real presence in the Eucharist, because no statement of it can be made that does not involve a contradiction. Luther admits this. His only escape is to call reason "Mrs. Hulda, the devil's whore"; abuse it as "that vain, quarrelsome termagant, Reason," and deny that the principle of contradiction is valid in theological questions. In this attitude towards reason, on the part of the Lutheran Church, we may find the explanation, in large degree, of the fact that the gospel in Germany has lost its hold upon the majority of thinking men.

I have left myself little space to speak, in direct terms, of the manner in which the author has done his work; but, after the samples given, little need be said.

Prof. Pünjer writes with unimpeachable fairness and impartiality. It seldom happens that a writer succeeds, as he has done, in keeping himself in the background. He never reads his own views into systems which he presents. He is eminently judicial, and therefore is a guide who may be safely followed.

Again, the sketches which make up this book are evidently the result of full mastery of the original sources. The impression is uniformly that which only a firm grasp on the part of the writer can make. Says Dr. Flint, in the preface: "The amount of information imparted is most extensive and strictly relevant. Nowhere else will the student get nearly so much knowledge as to what has been

thought and written, within the area of christendom, on the philosophy of religion. He must be an excessively learned man in that department who has nothing to learn from this book." It must be confessed, however, that Prof. Pünjer shows lack of acquaintance with the true nature and importance of the Puritan movement in England. This may be excused in a German who has evidently made an honest effort to acquaint himself with the English thought, in other directions, when so many nearer home regard Puritanism as a mere episode in English history.

The style is excellent. The language always serves to reveal, not to conceal, the thought. The translator has generally succeeded in making the book read like an original production in English; but occasionally a Germanism occurs to mar the effect.

It is sad to know, as we learn from Prof. Flint's preface, that the life of the author of this volume closed, three years ago, at the early age of thirty-five. By his abilities and industry he had made his way, in the face of great difficulties, to the position of *Professor Extraordinarius* at Jena, and was just entering upon the full tide of usefulness for which his learning fitted him when he was called away.

There remains another volume of his *History of the Christian Philosophy of Religion*, which is promised soon in an English dress. The work as a whole bears the title of "The Christian Philosophy of Religion in its Historical Development, with the Outline of a System."

JAMES F. LATIMER.

Union Theological Seminary in Virginia.

DEWEY'S PSYCHOLOGY.

PSYCHOLOGY. *By John Dewey, Ph. D., Assistant Professor of Philosophy in Michigan University.* Pp. 427. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1887.

From the modes of mental activity, the author distributes Psychology into Knowledge, Feeling, Will. Knowledge he distributes into its Elements, Processes and Stages. Feeling he distributes into Sensuous, Formal, Qualitative and Complex, under which come Intellectual, Æsthetic and Moral feeling. The Will he treats under sensuous Impulses, Volition, Physical Control, Prudential Control and Moral Control. This is a general outline of the treatise.

Psychology has been correctly defined as the science of the facts of consciousness. Logical order requires the psychologist, therefore, to give his attention first to consciousness, and upon it to do his clearest thinking and his most accurate defining. But our author says: "Consciousness can neither be defined nor described." Upon a subject which can neither be defined nor described we would not expect an author to write with clearness and fulness, and so our author says: "Psychology, accordingly, can study only the various *forms* of consciousness, showing the *conditions* under which they arise;" and, true to this statement, all that Dr. Dewey has to say about consciousness itself, the source of psychological facts, is to be found in stray paragraphs and sentences scattered through his volume. This we regard as a capital defect of method, but one which was necessitated by the author's conception of consciousness as indefinable and indescribable. Other students of mental science have defined consciousness, giving knowledge as its genus and immediacy as its specific difference. Others have taken immediate knowledge as its genus, and given the internal perception of mental states and acts as the specific difference which discriminates consciousness from that immediate knowledge which

the mind gets by using the bodily organism, and is known as sense-perception; in other words, there are two kinds of immediate knowledge, the one kind the mind gets through the sensorium, and the other without the use of any such physical organism—the former is perception proper; and the latter is consciousness proper. It behooved the author to set aside these definitions and descriptions of consciousness given by other students of mental science in some other way than by his mere affirmation. In another place he says: “Feeling, knowledge and will are not to be regarded as three *kinds* of consciousness; nor are they three separate parts of the same consciousness. They are the three aspects which every consciousness presents, according to the light in which it is considered.” According to this reduction every cognition, every emotion, every volition is a form of consciousness. Now, we ask what discriminates this generic consciousness so that it recognizes itself sometimes as cognition, sometimes as feeling, and sometimes as will? We, too, believe that consciousness is one, but it is a single power of knowledge, and by its own unique nature the soul recognizes immediately, without any *tertium quid*, some of its acts to be intellectual, others as emotive, and others still as volitional; and it is thoroughly erroneous to call cognition consciousness, and feeling consciousness, and the will consciousness; for consciousness is the power which the intellect possesses of recognizing certain generic acts of the soul-unit as cognitive, others as emotive, and others still as volitional. Again, Dr. Dewey says: “Feeling is the subjective side of consciousness, knowing its objective side. Will is the relation between the subjective and the objective. Every concrete consciousness is the connection between the individual as subjective, and the universe as objective.” If consciousness knows only its objective side, then how is the subjective feeling known? If consciousness is the connection between the subjective self and the objective universe, how is the purely mental act or state known; for example, a remembered feeling? In extenuation of all this confusion, we ask the reader to remember that Dr. Dewey is writing about an indefinable and indescribable thing!

We now notice Dr. Dewey's theory of knowledge, which is that department treated by the Scotch school under the head of the Intellect. He divides his subject into the elements, the processes and the stages of knowledge, thus discarding the old terminology of faculties or powers. The elements of knowledge are *sensations*, which, he says, “may be generically defined as any consciousness arising in the self through some bodily occasion.” “But these elements do not constitute knowledge.” “We have now to discover the process by which these sensations are elaborated into knowledge.” These two processes are *Apperception* and *Retention*, the one bringing the elements into consciousness and the other holding them therein. But the elements are in consciousness confused and massed; and need to be classified, and in effecting this classification there are several progressive stages. The first is *Perception*, which particularizes the sensuous elements; the second is *Memory*, which recalls those particular elements which were once present; the third is the *Imagination*, which idealizes these particular elements; the fourth is *Thinking*, which examines the relations between the elements themselves and assorts and classifies them; the fifth is the *Intuition*, which sees the result of all that has gone before—that is, the elements separated in perception recombined by thinking into the individual. Every act of knowledge passes through all these stages; and all the elements of all knowledge when thus combined give

three individuals—the world, the self, the God. “The whole previous discussion has been such as to make us recognize that there is no such thing as purely *immediate* knowledge.” This sentence alone dooms the theory. It was written and the theory was possible only because consciousness to Dr. Dewey was indefinable and indescribable!

We turn now to the author's theory of Feeling. “Feeling cannot be defined.” It “signifies not a special class of psychical facts.” It is “one side of all mental phenomena.” “There is no consciousness which is not feeling.” “Feeling is the interesting side of all consciousness.” Since feeling does not represent a special class of psychical facts, but is one side of all mental phenomena, it follows that there is no such thing as a pure act of intelligence nor a pure act of will, and the author condemns his own distribution of psychology. If a part, more or less, of the essence of feeling descends into every mental phenomenon, he ought to have assumed feeling as the *genus*, and made knowledge and will the *species*. That this ought to be his division of his subject is further proved by his identification of consciousness and feeling. But what better psychology could we expect when the author performs the remarkable feat of identifying an indefinable and indescribable consciousness with indefinable feeling!

The author's theory of volition: “The sensuous impulses form the basis, the material, the *sine qua non* of volition, but they do not constitute it. Volition is *regulated, harmonized impulse*.” But how are the sensuous impulses regulated and harmonized? “The successive steps of the process may be formulated as follows: First, there is awakened the state of mind known as *desire*; there is then a conflict of desires; this is concluded by the process of deliberation and *choice*; these result in the formation of an end of action, which serves as the purpose or *motive* of action; this purpose is then, through the medium of its felt desirability, handed over, as it were, to the realm of the impulses, which realize it.” The development of volition then is (1), impulse; (2), desire; (3), choice; (4), motive; (5), impulse. “Actually to do this, to realize the chosen end, impulse must be called in.” “The end can be brought about only by surrendering it to the realm of the impulses, which possess the necessary outgoing force. More properly, we reach an end by allowing the impulsive force of the desire which was checked during the process of deliberation to express itself through the act of choice. It is always a physical impulse of some sort or other which furnishes the force which realizes the end, thus changing the motive into a deed.” “Sensuous impulse is the will in the process of becoming. It is the will before it has obtained the control of itself; before it is self-determined.” Thus is the will-power reduced to an impulsive feeling.

This volume was written especially for class-room instruction. The publishers have gotten it up beautifully. But we would be sorry for its introduction into our schools, not only because we believe many of its main positions radically erroneous, but also because the author discards the ordinary terminology of psychology. The substitution of “elements of knowledge” and “processes of knowledge” for the old technicality of “faculties of knowledge” is a useless and confusing innovation upon mental science. The student, for whom the book was written who is *ex hypothesi* philosophically untrained, would find himself greatly embarrassed for the want of a technical vocabulary when entering upon advance studies. The great usefulness of the treatise is the full bibliographical references at the end of each chapter.

R. A. WEBB.

DAWSON'S EGYPT AND SYRIA.

EGYPT AND SYRIA: Their Physical Features in Relation to the Bible History. *By Sir J. William Dawson.* The Religious Tract Society of London.

Sir J. W. Dawson, better known to American readers as Principal Dawson, spent the winter of 1883-'4 in a journey through Egypt and Syria, "giving," as he tells us, "particular attention to the less known features of the geology of those lands, with especial reference to the bearing of facts of this kind on Bible history." To one acquainted with his writings on geological and archaeological subjects during the last thirty years, I need not say that there is no living scientist whose observations in these departments are more worthy of consideration than his. His acquaintance with natural science in all its departments, his long training in the observation of the facts of science in this country and in Europe, his careful study of prehistoric remains exhibited in his "Fossil Men and their Modern Representatives," and his devout christian character, eminently fit him for such a work as that in which he engaged during his recent travels in the East. I mention particularly his devout christian character as a qualification for writing such a book as that under review; for I think every ingenuous person who has read much of the writings of a certain class of scientists in our day must have been struck with the fact that the mere mention of Moses or the Bible seems to have an effect upon them like that of the waving of the red flag of the tauridor upon a mad bull. Among the interesting points treated of in this volume are:

1. The advanced civilization, and the knowledge of nature and art possessed by the early Egyptians, as exhibited in their works which remain to the present day. As illustrating this our author tells us: "In the Boulak Museum are two tables of offering of the earliest age of Egyptian art, made of the hardest quartzite of Jebel Ahmar, a rock harder than agate. They are large and thick slabs, worked in the most elaborate manner into a series of raised bowls and cups above, with inscriptions around the edges of the slabs. The rock is too hard to be cut with steel or bronze, except by a slow process of elaborate chipping, followed by polishing and drilling with emery or some other very hard material. . . . The Egyptians of the early kingdom had discovered and worked a great number of ornamental stones. They mined the turquoise in Arabia and the alabaster of their own lime-stones, and we find calcite, agate, cornelian, amethyst, fluor, garnet, serpentine, and lapis-lazuli commonly used for small ornaments. . . . The skill of the ancient Egyptians in working all kinds of gems and stones, and in the manufacture of jewelry, illustrates the early notice of such objects in the biblical books, for there can be no question that these arts had attained to a great development in Egypt before the time of Abraham." (Pp. 138, 139.)

It is not alone from an examination of their works of art which have come down to us, but from the deciphering of their papyri, that modern scholars have learned much respecting the early civilization of Egypt. On this point the author writes: "Egypt has been the originator of many of the arts and sciences, or, if not their originator, their preserver, in early historic times. Europe has learned here its earliest lessons in geometry, chemistry, medicine, architecture, and sculpture. We are beginning more and more to understand this, as we learn that much of the discovery in science and art hitherto attributed to the Greeks and the Arabians existed long previously in Egyptian papyri. It is very wonderful to find in these ancient docu-

ments—some of them dating from the earliest dynasties—chemical facts, arithmetical formulæ, and medical recipes almost in the identical form in which they were copied by Greeks and Arabs, heretofore believed to be their authors. Independently of this, we can discern in the great works of the early Egyptians more knowledge, both of nature and of practical science, than we can gather from the scanty remains of their writings.” (P. 163.)

2. On the subjects of the antiquity of the Egyptians as a people and the origin of their civilization, Sir J. W. Dawson writes: “When we read in the guide-books that Egyptian kings reigned over a great nation long before the time when Adam is generally supposed to have been expelled from paradise, it seems useless to look for any properly prehistoric men in Egypt. On the other hand, when we see the statement gravely made that the early civilization of Egypt implies countless ages of progress from a state of barbarism, we run into the opposite extreme, and conclude that the whole soil of the country must be filled with stone implements and with human bones. In truth, the absurdity of such statements makes us wonder that they meet with so much acceptance, or perhaps rather that such demands should be made by archaeologists on the credulity of the unscientific public.”

“The earliest dynasties of Egyptian kings are known to us chiefly by the facts gleaned from a few tombs and sculptures, and by the traditions of later ages; and even these sources of light fail with respect to the three earliest of Manetho's dynasties, of which only the names survive. Thus the only evidence of any human existence anterior to the earliest kings is that derived from the occurrence of certain chipped flints, supposed to be of human workmanship, and found in gravel, undoubtedly of great age. It will be necessary to sift this evidence, and ascertain what it contains of truth, and to what conclusions it legitimately leads.” (Pp. 123, 124.) This Dr. Dawson proceeded to do by visiting the place at which these chipped flints are found and examining them *in situ*; and the conclusion at which he arrived is expressed in his words: “The evidence for prehistoric man afforded by the Theban gravel is no better than that which is afforded by broken flints now being chipped by the torrents.” (P. 133.)

Of the origin of Egyptian civilization, our author writes: “It would thus appear that the only Egyptians we know anything of are those of the historical period, and these, we must believe, migrated into Egypt, not as barbarians, but in possession of all the knowledge and artistic skill of that long antediluvian age of which their immediate ancestors were the survivors. The use of the more important metals, the building of cities and ships, the tillage of the soil, and the domestication of animals were all acquisitions of the antediluvian age. These the primitive Egyptians must have brought with them; and in a land so abundant in food, and with such resources for quarrying and transportation of materials, they must have had ample opportunity for carrying them into practice.” (P. 136.) Strange it is that, with the history of the civilization of the United States and Australia before him, the civilization of their mother-country transferred in an advanced condition, Prof. Owen, when confronted by the fact that “Egyptian civilization has no archæic period,” should have found his only solution in the assumption that the Egyptians must have existed through many long ages, leaving no vestige of that existence behind them.

GEO. D. ARMSTRONG.

DAWSON'S GEOLOGICAL HISTORY OF PLANTS.

THE GEOLOGICAL HISTORY OF PLANTS. *By Sir J. William Dawson.* New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1888.

The above-named work of Sir J. W. Dawson is his latest contribution to the scientific literature of the day. "The writer of this work, born in a district rich in fossil plants, began to collect and work at them as a boy, in connection with botanical and geological pursuits. He has thus been engaged in the study of fossil plants for nearly half a century, and, while he has published much on the subject, has endeavored carefully to keep within the sphere of ascertained facts, and has made it a specialty to collect, as far as possible, what has been published by others. He has also enjoyed opportunities of correspondence or personal intercourse with most of the more eminent workers in the subject. Now in the evening of his days, he thinks it right to endeavor to place before the world a summary of facts and of his own mature conclusions," (pp. 1, 2.) This he has done in the work before us; a work evidently written with great care and in the lucid style of the author's other writings, and covering a department of geology on which there has been hitherto no good treatise of moderate size acceptable to the general English reader.

• One of the conclusions at which the author arrives, after his fifty-years' study of fossil plants, he states as follows, viz.: After quoting with approval the statement of another—"here, also, the evidence is against evolution, and there is none in favor of it"—he writes: "It is easy to see that similar difficulties beset every attempt to trace the development of plants, on the principle of slow and gradual evolution, and we are driven back on the theory of periods of rapid origin, as we have already seen suggested by Saprota in the case of the cretaceous dicotyledons. Such abrupt and plentiful introduction of species over large areas at the same time, by whatever cause effected—and we are quite ignorant of any secondary causes—becomes in effect something not unlike the old and familiar idea of creation. Science must, indeed, always be baffled by questions of ultimate origin, and, however far it may be able to trace the chain of secondary causation and development, must at length find itself in the presence of the great Creative Mind, who is 'before all things and in whom all things consist.'" (Pp. 270, 271.)

A little more than a year ago, Mr. William Carruthers, President of the Linnean Society of Great Britain, and Keeper of the Botanical Department of the British Museum, in a public lecture delivered in London, declared: "After forty years of study of plant-life, and as the result of close investigation, I have not discovered any perceptible difference in plants that are left to themselves. The same principle of permanence has been true of plants for three hundred years." This he asserts as the result of his examination of the botanical collections preserved in the British Museum. "Three hundred years, however, is also a very short time. But what shall we say of three thousand years? Plants have been preserved in Egypt for that time. By the opening of tombs of historic personages, the date of whose life has been accurately ascertained, specimens of plants have been obtained which have been wonderfully preserved. The examination of these materials has been made by a botanist who is thoroughly acquainted with the existing flora of Egypt, for Dr. Schweinfurth has for a quarter of a century been exploring the plants of the Nile valley. These plant-remains were included within mummy-wrappings, and being thus hermetically sealed, have been preserved with scarcely

any change. By placing them in warm water, Dr. Schweinfurth has succeeded in preparing a series of specimens gathered three thousand years ago, which are as satisfactory for the purposes of science as any collection at the present day. Three thousand years have not been sufficient to produce a single difference."

But Mr. Carruthers does not stop here. His study of plant life was carried back, in the midst of the fossil specimens which surrounded him in the great Museum. He has little faith in geological computations of time—says, in fact, "they are all a guess." But assuming these computations to approximate the truth, he says, "The considerable remains of the pre-glacial flora show, that two hundred and fifty thousand years have not produced any appreciable change. Plants two hundred and fifty thousand years old have all appeared in their most highly differentiated condition. They possessed *then* all the characters that they have ever attained to, in their subsequent history. We hold, therefore, that while species are not permanent when man interferes, they are always permanent in a state of nature;" and that "the theory of evolution is contradicted by the story of plant-life." (*Quoted from Philadelphia Presbyterian, April 10, 1887.*)

The evidence by which its advocates seek to establish the hypothesis of evolution is drawn largely from alleged facts in the history of the vegetable kingdom. In Grant Allen's two popular books, "Vignettes from Nature," and "The Evolutionist at Large," more than half his examples of evolutionary change are such as he supposes to have occurred in particular plants; I say, "supposes to have occurred," for he does not pretend that any one of these changes has taken place within the knowledge of man. Respecting the animal kingdom, Prof. Huxley writes: "It is not absolutely proven that a group of animals, having all the characters exhibited by species in nature, has ever been originated by selection, whether artificial or natural." (*Lay Sermons*, p. 295.) And Charles Darwin virtually concedes the permanence of natural species when he writes, "I doubt whether any case of a perfectly fertile hybrid animal can be considered as thoroughly well authenticated." (*Origin of Species*, p. 238.) And Prof. L. Agassiz writes, "Breeds (*i. e.*, varieties) among animals are the work of man; species were created by God." (*Methods of Study in Natural History*, p. 147) Such is the testimony of these eminent scientists respecting the animal kingdom. And, now, we have the testimony of two of the most eminent "Paleo-botanists" of the day, that this same permanence of species is evident in the vegetable kingdom; and that this is true not only of the vegetable kingdom as it now exists, but has been true of it from the beginning. On this ground Mr. Carruthers affirms that "the theory of evolution is contradicted by the story of plant-life."

GEO. D. ARMSTRONG.

VIII. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE JEWS; or, Prediction and Fulfilment: An Argument for the Times. *By Samuel H. Kellogg, D. D.* New edition, with an Appendix. Cloth, 8vo, \$1.50. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1887.

The author well entitles his book "an argument for the times." There is hardly a question of race history and development that is invested with more interest just now, or that is receiving, and justly, a larger share of public attention. The recent movements in Russia, England, and America point to a rapidly developing and practical interest in the immediate future of the Jews. In studying that question, and considering the Scriptures which set forth the future of God's ancient people, the author shows a thorough mastery of the subject in all its details, and a thorough and intelligent acquaintance with the many facts which shed light upon it. His delineation of the literary, financial and political development of Israel in modern times shows extensive reading and great erudition. The views maintained are essentially the same as those recently published in this journal, and which are held by a large and increasing number of christian scholars. The book is a most valuable one, and should find a place in the library of every student of the Bible and of history.

THE BOOK OF GENESIS. *By Marcus Dods, D. D., Author of "Israel's Iron Age," "The Parables of Our Lord," etc.* Crown 8vo, pp 445. \$1.50. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1888.

THE FIRST BOOK OF SAMUEL. *By the Rev. Professor W. G. Blaikie, D. D., LL. D., New College, Edinburgh.* Crown 8vo, pp. 440. \$1.50. *The same publishers.*

These volumes are a further instalment of "The Expositor's Bible," now issuing from the press of the Armstrongs, and offered to regular subscribers to the whole series at the exceedingly low price of \$6.00 for six volumes. The series is admirably planned as to the scholarship and ability of the writers, the editorial care, and the manner in which the various books are to be prepared. It is the aim of the editor to secure a thoroughly good commentary without the "padding technicality" and detail that repel the ordinary and, sometimes, even the well-trained reader. The volume on Genesis well sustains this purpose. It consists not so much of expositions of the successive verses or paragraphs as of dissertations upon the leading points of the chapters. Dr. Dods has been remarkably successful in dealing with the most important subjects before him. In treating of the adjustment of Moses' account of creation with the teaching of science he says: "All attempts to force its statements into such accord are futile and mischievous. They are futile, because they do not convince independent enquirers, but only those who are unduly anxious to be convinced; and they are mischievous, because they

unduly prolong the strife between Scripture and science, putting the question on a false issue. And, above all, they are to be condemned because they do violence to Scripture, foster a style of interpretation by which the text is forced to say whatever the interpreter desires, and prevent us from recognizing the real nature of these sacred writings . . . They are its worst friends who distort the Bible's words that they may yield a meaning more in accordance with scientific truth." Concerning the truths taught in the first and second chapters, he says: "The first is, that there has been a creation, that things now existing have not just grown of themselves, but have been called into being by a presiding intelligence and an originating will. . . . The other is, that man was the chief work of God, for whose sake all else was brought into being." He turns the guns of John Stuart Mill and Professor Tyndall upon themselves, in apt citations from their writings, where they confess that the balance of probability and the testimony of clear and vigorous thought tend to prove creation by intelligence.

Dr. Blaikie's exposition of First Samuel is just what we have learned to expect of him—sound, scriptural, learned, and full of common-sense.

ROMANISM AND THE REFORMATION, from the Standpoint of Prophecy. *By H. Grattan Guinness, F. R. G. S., Author of "Light for the Last Days," etc.* 8vo, pp. ix., 396. \$1.50. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1887.

The author, a well-known evangelist, presents here, in a series of eight lectures, recently delivered in Exeter Hall, London, the attitude of Romanism toward the Protestant world, and most earnestly points out the need for a renewal of the Reformation spirit. He seeks to show that Romanism is distinctly and clearly foretold by Daniel, Paul, and John. Whether one agrees with his interpretation or not, his conclusions and warnings will be accepted. He shows that Rome is the deadly foe of freedom; that, as Bismarck has said, "The papacy has ever been a *political power*, which, with the greatest audacity, and with the most momentous consequences, has interfered in the affairs of the world." The present aggressiveness of Rome in this country, the adroitness with which its cardinal-leader is manipulating political, educational, and social influences, not to speak of his recent practical effort in the South to engage State and municipal governments in the work of importing Romanists into this country by wholesale, render a work like this exceedingly valuable. It should be read and commended as widely as possible.

HEBRAICA, a Quarterly Journal in the Interest of Semitic Study. *Managing Editor, William R. Harper, Ph. D., Professor of Semitic Languages, Yale University; Principal of Schools of the Institute of Hebrew.* Associate Editors, Paul Haupt, Ph. D., Professor of Johns Hopkins University, and Hermann L. Strack, Ph. D., D. D., Professor of Theology, University of Berlin. \$2.00 per annum; 65 ct. s. per number. Hebraica: New Haven, Conn.

Already indispensable to the more advanced student of the Semitic languages, this admirable periodical proposes to make itself more widely useful. With the July number it will begin a discussion of "The Pentateuchal Question," in which both sides will be ably represented, and in which the student of that question will

be led by the master hands of Drs. William Henry Green and William R. Harper. The latter will present the views and claims of the analysts, while Dr. Green will oppose them. In thus presenting these views, Dr. Harper has a most difficult and delicate task to perform, and he desires that it be understood that the views *presented* by him are not necessarily his own. But who that knows the man will doubt his ability fairly and learnedly to state the views even of those whom he may oppose? The discussion promises to be one of the most able and valuable ever undertaken. The present importance and far-reaching character of the question should give this discussion wide circulation.

DIVINE HEALING; or, The Atonement for Sin and Sickness. *By Capt. R. Kelso Carter.* New edition, rewritten and enlarged. Pp. 189. New York: John B. Alden. 1888.

The book is an attempt to show that the "faith-cure" doctrine is scriptural. Its author is recognized as the same who had a hearing in advocacy of his views in the *Century* for March, 1887, where, by the way, he now complains that he was allowed only four pages, while his opponents, Drs. Schauffler and Buckley, occupied about thirty. He reproduces here the article, published there in reduced form. As an exponent of his faith, we suppose the author may be considered as good as anybody else, and the student who wishes to examine that side of the question may here find a full exposition of it.

BIBLE STUDIES IN BAPTISM. *By Rev. J. D. McLean.* Fourth Edition, revised and enlarged. Richmond: Whittet & Shepperson, Printers.

The author, an earnest and successful pastor, has brought together in these twenty-nine short pages a rare amount of argument and proof of the true method and subjects of baptism. Having studied it with the needs of his own people before him, the writer has dealt with the matter practically and forcibly. The tract will be found useful for general circulation in all our congregations.

JUDAISM ON THE SOCIAL QUESTION. *By Rabbi H. Berkowitz.* Pp. 130. Cloth, 50 cents. New York: John B. Alden. 1888.

In a series of thirteen discourses, the author deals first historically with the subject of socialism, showing the difficulty of the question and the absolute failure of every scheme adopted to solve it. With true loyalty to his faith he then leads us to Moses, and endeavors to show how, in the system of that great law-giver, there is an always practicable and adaptable means of adjusting the difficulties. The treatment is earnest and attractive. The reader will wish, however, that the author had followed the ancient faith to its true development in the person and work of Israel's Messiah, in whose life and work the old principle, "thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," received a new meaning and power.

THE SENSUALISTIC PHILOSOPHY OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY CONSIDERED, *By Robert L. Dabney, D. D., LL. D., Late Professor of Divinity in the Union Theological Seminary, Va., and Professor of Philosophy in the University of Texas.* New and enlarged edition. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1888.

The cordiality with which this work was received by thoughtful men everywhere when it first appeared, and the demand for it since, has led the author to prepare a new and enlarged edition. As a full consideration of it will be found in another department of this number of the *QUARTERLY* (page 275), we refer our readers to that, with the further statement that it is our hope that as to those points wherein the distinguished reviewer and equally eminent author differ, our readers may hereafter enjoy further able discussions from their pens.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION. A Series of Addresses, Essays, and Sermons, designed to set forth great truths in popular form. *By Augustus Hopkins Strong, D. D., President and Professor of Biblical Theology in the Rochester Theological Seminary.* 8vo, pp. 632. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1888.

The title would suggest that this splendid volume is a single treatise. The subtitle, however, indicates its character. It is a collection of valuable papers and sermons, on a variety of philosophical, religious and literary subjects, and accompanied by an unusually copious index, which adds greatly to the value of the book and does much towards unifying its parts. The reader who believes in ordination "with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery," will not concur with President Strong's views on "Councils of Ordination: Their Powers and Duties," and will be amused with the definition of the calling of a council to ordain as "a regular method of appeal from the church unadvised to the church advised by its brethren;" while, in the same sentence, the essayist declares that the council's approving the candidate "is only the essential completing" of an ordination, etc. The constant effort of all Independents to steer clear of the doctrine of Presbytery while using its practices is an interesting study. The denominationalism which appears in certain parts of this collection, however, is pardonable, coming as it does from one who is sincere, intelligent and earnest, and who makes no apology for offering his "testimony." Besides, there is so much in the book that all lovers of orthodoxy in philosophy and religion will delight to read that this volume will take a deserved place in the literature of the church at large. The author's discussion of the New Theology, "the theology of exaggerated individualism," his addresses on the Philosophy of Evolution, on Miracles as Attesting a Divine Revelation, as well as the many sermons here given, make the work a delightfully attractive one. It is scholarly, philosophical, and sound.

A HISTORY OF THE INQUISITION OF THE MIDDLE AGES. *By Henry Charles Lea.* In three volumes. Vol. III. Royal, 8vo.; pp. 738. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1888.

This, the concluding volume of the author's History of the Inquisition, deserves the warm commendations which were given its predecessors. It is characterized throughout by the same careful and painstaking investigation and presentation of facts, accompanied, in the latter part of the volume, by a conclusion in which the author most justifiably displays some of that feeling which the recital of the facts doubtless awoke all along, but which, with the philosophic spirit of the true historian, he had repressed. The volume before us, entitled "Special Fields of Inquisitorial Activity," gives us chapters on the Spiritual Franciscans; Guglielma and Dolcino; The Fraticelli; Political Heresy Utilized by the Church; The Same

Utilized by the State; Sorcery and Occult Arts; Witchcraft; and Intellect and Faith. The author eloquently concludes his work—a work admirable in all its parts, and that must become the standard of reference on its important theme,—and summarizes the career of the mediæval Inquisition in these words:

“It introduced a system of jurisprudence which infected the criminal law of all the lands subjected to its influence, and rendered the administration of penal justice a cruel mockery for centuries. It furnished the Holy See with a powerful weapon of aggrandizement; it tempted secular sovereigns to imitate the example, and it prostituted the name of religion to the vilest temporal ends. It stimulated the morbid sensitiveness to doctrinal aberrations until the most trifling dissidence was capable of arousing insane fury, and of convulsing Europe from end to end. On the other hand, when atheism became fashionable in high places, its thunders were mute. Energetic only in evil, when its powers might have been used on the side of virtue, it held its hand and gave the people to understand that the only sins demanding repression were doubt as to the accuracy of the Church's knowledge of the unknown, and attendance on the Sabbat. In its long career of blood and fire, the only credit which it can claim is the suppression of the pernicious dogmas of the Cathari, and in this its agency was superfluous, for those dogmas carried in themselves the seeds of self-destruction and might more wisely have been left to self-extinction. Thus the judgment of impartial history must be that the Inquisition was the monstrous offspring of mistaken zeal, utilized by selfish greed and lust of power to smother the higher aspirations of humanity and stimulate its baser appetites.”

THE HOLY LAND AND THE BIBLE. A Book of Scripture Illustrations gathered in Palestine. *By Cunningham Geikie, D. D.* With a Map of Palestine and 212 Illustrations reproduced from the celebrated German work of Dr. Georg Ebers. 2 Vols., small 4to, pp. 656. Half morocco, \$2; in one vol., cloth, \$1.25. New York: John B. Alden. 1888.

The two handsome volumes before us are a fit setting for so goodly a work. Dr. Geikie has here, as in his “Hours with the Bible,” displayed great learning, a reverent spirit, and rare capacity to instruct. His descriptions of the Holy Land are fresh and vivid. His use of what he sees in Palestine is natural and impressive. He illuminates the Scriptures, and while giving just enough of his own experience and impressions to sustain the reader's interest, is careful to subordinate every page to the great end of the book, the presenting the Land as “a natural commentary on the sacred writings.” The illustrations in this edition, which are not found in the English edition, are as excellent as they are numerous, and add greatly to its value.

A DIGEST OF THE ACTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES, from its Organization to the Assembly of 1887, inclusive, with certain Historical and Explanatory Notes. *By Rev. W. A. Alexander.* Pp. xv., 551. Richmond, Va.: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1888. *Net*, \$4.00.

The Southern Church is to be congratulated upon the appearance of this Digest, and by appearance we mean both advent and looks. It is a portly volume, beautifully printed in new type on fine paper, bound in the most admirable manner in sheep, and altogether an honor to the publishers and their printers. A more creditable piece of work has never been executed. A Digest has for some time

been greatly needed. The Church has had a separate history long enough to formulate her principles and manifest her method of work, and the scarcity of copies of her earlier records was so great that the time had come when her adherents could hardly afford to be without such a volume. The compiler has done his work faithfully and well. The classification of Acts is good. The prominence given to the record of the Church's executive agencies will be universally approved, not only because in her method of conducting these agencies the Southern Church is carrying out her convictions as against the Board system, but also because it is largely in this department that the true Church of Christ manifests her life and power. The compiler deserves thanks for his work.

CENTENNIAL ADDRESSES. Delivered at the celebration of the Centennial of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, in the Academy of Music and Horticultural Hall, Philadelphia, May 24, 1888. Published by authority, etc. Second and revised edition. 8vo., pp. 233. Paper, 75 cents; cloth, \$1. Philadelphia: McCalla & Co., 237-239 Dock street.

Those of us who heard on that long-to-be-remembered Thursday that the addresses then delivered would be ready for distribution in book form the next morning, were full of wonder at the enterprise of the publishers. The book appeared, though a little delayed, and is a permanent record of one of the most memorable days in the history of American Presbyterianism. The public is too familiar with the addresses delivered to need any account of them here. Suffice it to say, that in this volume they are complete, in all their power and beauty and instructiveness. We could wish that as printed these addresses could contain more of the extemporaneous remarks or sentences, or by-play, that from time to time thrilled or delighted the vast audiences. The pleasantries of Drs. Hall and Hoge, the marvellously keen and striking "hits" of Dr. Hays, and the thrilling words of Dr. Jerry Witherspoon that wrought up the Academy of Music audience to the highest pitch of enthusiasm, do not appear here at all. This is to be accounted for by the fact that the speakers' manuscripts, or copies, were in the printers' hands some days or weeks before, and the publishers surely forgot to engage stenographic reporters or to make use of the very accurate reports given of these matters in the Philadelphia papers. We could wish, also, that the printers had "leaded" the pages. It would have given a much handsomer appearance to the book. Nevertheless, the collection here given is an admirable one, and no intelligent Presbyterian, North or South, can afford to be without a copy of the book.

CYCLOPÆDIA OF UNIVERSAL HISTORY. Being an account of the principal events in the career of the human race, from the beginnings of civilization to the present time. From recent and authentic sources. Complete in Three Volumes. *By John Clark Ridpath, LL.D., Professor of History in DePaul University, etc.* Imperial octavo, pp. 2438. Cincinnati: The Jones Brothers Publishing Company; Charleston: Garibaldi Casta & Co. *Sold by subscription.*

A magnificent work, in both literary and mechanical features. The author has here displayed the same ability that has characterized all his other work, and given him a deserved reputation as a historian and teacher. In a style of crystal-line clearness, but not wanting in force, he attracts every reader and fastens his

thought or description upon even the youngest minds. In a work covering so wide a field of history, the whole world, in all time, there is not given an opportunity to enter largely into the profounder depths of the philosophy of history. Dr. Ridpath does not hesitate, however, to reason where reasoning will not divert the mind from his great purpose, which is to popularize history without losing sight of the dignity and importance of the historian's office. As a result, his work is a singularly happy blending of clearness, brevity and strength. The hundreds of illustrations, many of them full-page engravings, and the valuable and accurate maps, add to the usefulness of the work. The very extensive index provided makes the work really what it claims to be, an encyclopædia of history. The writer of this notice can declare from experience that this work is the best he has ever known for general family purposes. The only settlement he finds of the struggle among the children for the History, is in giving each one a volume; and many a time has he solved the problems and answered the questions of the "inquisitive boy" by simply saying: Look at "Ridpath!" It is a set of books that will bring peace and comfort.

VIEW OF THE STATE OF EUROPE DURING THE MIDDLE AGES. *By Henry Hallam, LL. D., F. R. A. S.* New York: John B. Alden, Publisher. 1888. In four volumes, cloth, per set, \$1.75; in two volumes, half morocco, per set, \$2.50.

These volumes have been long regarded as "authoritative" on that period of the world's history to which they relate—from the middle of the fifth century to the end of the fifteenth. The author was born in 1778, and died in 1859. Vol. I.: The History of France from its Conquest by Clovis to the Invasion of Naples by Charles VIII.; an Account of the Feudal System. Vol. II.: History of Italy, from the Extinction of the Carolingian Emperors to the Invasion of Naples by Charles VIII.; History of Spain to the Conquest of Granada; History of Germany to the Diet of Worms, in 1495; History of the Greeks and Saracens. Vol. III.: The Constitutional History of England; The Anglo-Norman Constitution; The English Constitution. Vol. IV.: History of the Ecclesiastical Power during the Middle Ages; The State of Society in Europe during the Middle Ages. "Hallam's works," says Prof. John S. Hart, "are so well known that it is scarcely necessary to do more than allude to them. They are characterized by every feature that should mark the historian—accuracy of research, breadth of view, elegance of style. They are to be regarded as marking a new era in the study of the middle ages and of constitutional history." And, perhaps, every one knows the glowing praise which Macaulay pays him in the *Edinburgh Review*, when his Constitutional History was under note. Nothing need be added to these testimonies of worth; but the publisher who has given us this able work in cheap, substantial, and beautiful form is to be commended. Of the set on our table, the binding is half morocco; the edges are marbled; the paper is thick; the type is large and delightful to the eye; the illustrations, which are ordinary, are one hundred and twenty-four in number; the price has already been given.

STILL HOURS. *By Richard Rothe.* Translated by Jane T. Stoddart. With an Introductory Essay by the Rev. John Macpherson, M. A. 12mo, pp. 425. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1888.

A book of short, pithy paragraphs, upon a variety of themes, selected from

the writings of a widely-known and able Wittenberg and Heidelberg professor. The reader will in these pages find much that is suggestive and stimulating. Discrimination will be necessary, however, in accepting his views. His piety was evidently of the active, ardent type, and his views of the religious life decidedly evangelical. Rationalism found nothing congenial in his mind or heart. His views of the church, however, were remarkable for such a man. The following passage is a specimen: "The first word of the advocates of the church is that some institution is indispensable as a means for transmitting the gospel to humanity. But, in the present position of christianity, is there really need of such a special institution? What *can* the church do in this direction which the state does not also do entirely of its own accord? Is it that the church transmits along with the gospel its own interpretation of it—its dogma? But matters have now come to such a stand that the only part of dogma which has or can have the slightest authority is that which christian sentiment and christian science have learned quite independently of it. What does the church of the present know of Christ and christianity (as a historical fact) more than the christian world?" Throughout, Rothe manifests a tendency which is anti-ecclesiastical, and appears to regard the christian state, rather than the church, as God's means for fulfilling the mission of christianity. So much for one's education in a state church!

THE BRIGHTER SIDE OF SUFFERING, and Other Poems. *By Robert Whittet.* 8vo, square, pp. 384. Cloth, gilt, \$2. Richmond, Va.: Whittet & Shepperson.

That in the busy life which he leads, the author should have found time to write these touching poems illustrates both his ability and his industry. They are the product of odd half-hours and wanderings by the wayside, he tells us; but none the less are they rich in thought, beautiful in expression, and full of genuine christian philosophy. The poem which occupies the greater part of the book and gives its title is a philosophic, but not the less poetic presentation of the suffering in nature, whereby the highest type of her beauty is attained, the suffering whereby national liberty is obtained, the suffering in the individual life and experience of man, and the highest conception of suffering, suffering for others, so wondrously signalized in the life of Christ. The volume is beautifully bound and is particularly valuable as a gift-book, especially to those whom God calls to pass through the shadows. There is a sunniness, a cheerful courage, about it which will make it most happy in lighting up many gloomy passages in life. It may not be amiss to add here that the fine taste of the author is a guarantee to our readers that this QUARTERLY, which is now largely shaped as to its external features by his hands, will be made the best type of work in its line.

GLIMPSES OF MAORI LAND. *By Annie R. Butler.* 12mo, pp. 318. \$1.25. New York: American Tract Society. 1888.

Beautifully printed, beautifully bound and beautifully illustrated, this simple, unaffected account of a visit to New Zealand, and of the scenes and people and customs witnessed there is a charming book to place in the hands of any one. The children will like it, for stories of New Zealand life are not common. The christian will like it for the pure, spiritual character that shows out on every page. The soul that yearns for the advancement of Christ's kingdom abroad will like it,

for the practical account it gives of the accomplishment and needs of missionary work in that remote quarter of the globe. It is a book which the most careful and wise should unhesitatingly select for the Sabbath-school or home library.

THE VOCATION OF THE PREACHER. *By E. Paxton Hood.* 8vo, pp. 528. Price, \$2.00. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1888.

When Rev. E. Paxton Hood died, one of the most brilliant and able of writers on homiletics passed away. All who read his *Lamps, Pitchers, and Trumpets*, and *The Throne of Eloquence: Great Preachers, Ancient and Modern*, will welcome this first American edition of the work upon which the author was engaged when he was stricken down. They will recognize in it the *second* of what was intended to have been a series of volumes on pulpit work and workers, partly consisting of chapters from previous works, long out of print, and partly the result of a more recent course of lectures delivered in Boston in 1881. The feast spread before the reader may be inferred from the table of contents. *Vide:* The Instinct for Souls; The Preacher's Vocation—the Instinct for Souls; Frederick William Faber, the Preacher of the Oratory and the Cloister; Mediæval and Post-Mediæval Preachers; The Great English Cardinal, John Henry Newman; Concerning the Imagination; Dr. Edward Andrews, of Walworth; The Paper in the Pulpit; James Parsons; Billingsgate in the Pulpit; James Wels; The Pulpit of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries; Puritan Adams; The Preachers of Wild Wales; The Place of the Pulpit in Poetry and Fiction; Some Varieties of Clerical Life from a Preacher's Point of View.

Those who have never read the author can do no better than to form his acquaintance by reading this fresh, breezy, thought-stimulating work, while those who now admire him will deny themselves in order to own this volume.

THE THRONE OF ELOQUENCE: Great Preachers, Ancient and Modern. *By E. Paxton Hood.* 8vo, pp. 479. Price, \$2.00. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1888.

This work was issued in England in 1885, and many American ministers have become acquainted with it through the English editions. This edition has been issued to meet reiterated demands and supply a long-felt want. Rev. E. Paxton Hood was one of London's best known preachers, and one of the most prolific and racy writers on homiletics that used the English tongue. He never wrote a line that was dull or dry; his fund of anecdote was inexhaustible, and he had remarkable power of illustration. Ministers who desire to possess the standard works relating to their vocation will purchase this authorized edition of an English classic, and its companion, *The Vocation of the Preacher*, by the same author, noticed above. *The Throne of Eloquence* contains chapters on such general themes as: The Pulpit the Throne of Eloquence; The False Finery of the Pulpit; But what is Eloquence? Wit, Humor, and Drollery in the Pulpit; Live Coals, Texts and Topics of Discourse; Live Coals and Dry Sticks; The Use and Abuse of the Imagination; and analyses of the characters of great preachers, such as St. Bernard, Jeremy Taylor, Chrysostom, Father Taylor, Alexander Waugh, James Stratten, and Henry Melvill.

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

EDITORS: G. B. STRICKLER, D. D.; E. H. BARNETT, D. D.

MANAGER: GEORGE SUMMEY, CHESTER, S. C.

VOL. II. OCTOBER, 1888. No. 3.

- I. THE PENTATEUCHAL STORY OF CREATION. Geo. D. Armstrong, D. D., LL. D.
 - II. THE RELATION OF MIRACLE TO THE EVIDENCES OF A DIVINE REVELATION. John L. Girardeau, D. D., LL. D.
 - III. A SHORT METHOD WITH ANTI-THEISTIC SCIENTISTS. Robert Watts, D. D., LL. D.
 - IV. WAS CHRIST LIABLE TO SIN? C. W. Humphreys.
 - V. THE NON-SECULAR CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH. C. R. Vaughan, D. D.
 - VI. RELIGIOUS ROMANCES OF GEORGE MACDONALD. James H. Smith.
 - VII. NOTES:
 - Evangelism, Again. J. F. Cannon, D. D.
 - Scottish-Virginia Presbyterianism. W. T. Price.
 - Drummond's Apology to Scientists. D. E. Frierson, D. D.
 - VIII. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS: By John L. Girardeau, B. B. Warfield, James F. Latimer, Samuel M. Smith, J. W. Rosebro, R. A. Webb and Geo. D. Armstrong.
 - IX. NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.
-

CHESTER, S. C.:

MANAGER "PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY."

NEW YORK: ANSON D. F. RANDOLPH & CO.

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY

IS UNDER THE SUPERVISION AND CONTROL OF AN ASSOCIATION

COMPOSED OF THE FOLLOWING MINISTERS:

GEO. D. ARMSTRONG, D. D., LL. D.; E. H. BARNETT, D. D.; JOHN F. CANNON, D. D.; WM. C. CLARK; J. N. CRAIG, D. D.; A. B. CURRY; ROBT. L. DABNEY, D. D. LL. D.; JNO. L. GIRARDEAU, D. D., LL. D.; C. R. HEMPHILL, D. D.; C. C. HERSMAN, D. D.; T. W. HOOPER, D. D.; C. W. HUMPHREYS; ISAAC J. LONG, D. D.; A. W. MILLER, D. D.; W. W. MOORE, D. D.; B. M. PALMER, D. D., LL. D.; THOS. E. PECK, D. D., LL. D.; J. B. SHEARER, D. D.; SAMUEL M. SMITH, D. D.; R. K. SMOOT, D. D., LL. D.; G. B. STRICKLER, D. D.; ROBERT A. WEBB; T. D. WITHER-
SPOON, D. D., LL. D.

THE QUARTERLY will endeavor to represent the views and literature of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, and to promote the interests of the Church in all her relations and departments of work.

An opportunity will be given in its pages for the fair and impartial discussion, within limits, of the great questions of the day.

Each number will contain one or two distinctively theological or philosophical articles, with others of a more popular character. In a separate department of Notes, the effort will be made to give brief discussions of matters of present moment, and in such form as to be of special value to the thinking people of the Church outside the ranks of the ministry.

Special attention will be given to current literature; and critical notices, full rather than numerous, of the most valuable new books will be prepared by men specially trained in the several departments of learning or work to which they belong.

A large number of articles on timely and important subjects has been engaged, and the patrons of the QUARTERLY may confidently expect it to be kept up to a high standard of ability and timeliness.

Each writer is responsible for the views expressed in his article, and ordinarily the author's name will be appended.

Address all communications, mss., etc., to the Manager, Chester, S. C.

Copyright, 1888.
George Summey, Manager.

Entered as second-class matter
at the Post-office, Chester, S. C.

Whittet & Shepperson, Richmond, Va., Printers.

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 6.—OCTOBER, 1888.

I. THE PENTATEUCHAL STORY OF CREATION.

IN the opening portion of the Book of Genesis we have a history of creation which claims to be a direct revelation from God. Geology aims to give us a history of creation gathered from a careful study of the structure of the earth itself, especially the study of its fossils—those “medals of creation,” as they have been aptly termed—in which many things respecting the order of creation are written for our learning.

These two histories ought to be in perfect harmony the one with the other. The books of revelation and of nature, where they cover the same ground, ought to agree. And yet, as a matter of fact, and as these two records are often interpreted, so great is their apparent discrepancy as to lead Prof. Huxley to write:

“My belief is, and long has been, that the Pentateuchal story of creation is simply a myth. I suppose it to be a hypothesis respecting the origin of the universe which some ancient thinker found himself able to reconcile with his knowledge of the nature of things, and therefore assumed to be true. As such I hold it to be not only an interesting, but a venerable monument of a stage in the mental progress of mankind, . . . and to possess neither more nor less scientific importance than the cosmogonies of the Egyptians and Babylonians.”—*Order of Creation*, page 147.

Such discrepancies as are alleged in this case are, I believe, apparent, not real, and may be owing either to a misinterpretation of the Pentateuchal story of creation, or to a misreading of the

“rock-record” by the geologist. Those to which Prof. Huxley refers in the article from which the above quotation is made, and on which he bases his rejection of “the Pentateuchal story,” are, if I mistake not, owing largely to his misinterpretation of that story—a misinterpretation growing out of his failure to pay proper attention to the difference in character of the two histories.

1. Genesis is a part of Scripture, written for the purpose of teaching the true religion, and, in so far as it is historical, it belongs to what we are accustomed to call, distinctively, sacred history. Geology is a human science, and the history of creation which it gives us originates with man, is man’s reading of the “rock-records” of the earth, and hence belongs to the category of secular or profane history. The difference between these two kinds of history we may learn by comparing Mosheim’s “Ecclesiastical History” with Gibbon’s “Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.” They cover the same ground, they are histories of the same peoples during the same centuries, and hence both record many of the same events; *e. g.*, the conversion of the Emperor Constantine, and the removal of the capital from Rome to Constantinople. But they have been written with different ends in view; the difference we indicate by the terms sacred and secular, or ecclesiastical and civil, and hence each very properly records events of which the other takes no notice. Mosheim tells us of the introduction of christianity into Gaul under the ministry of Pothinus, whilst Gibbon does not even mention Pothinus’ name; and Gibbon gives a graphic description of Julian’s night-passage of the Tigris in the face of the enemy, and his utter defeat of the Persians, whilst Mosheim has not a word on the subject. This is just as it ought to be, and no one for a moment imagines any discrepancy between the two histories on this account.

2. A second fact, which should never be lost sight of in comparing the Pentateuchal account of creation with that of geology, is the exceeding brevity of the former. Dana’s “Geological Story Briefly Told” is the best short summary of geological science I know of, and forms a volume of two hundred and sixty-three pages, whilst Moses’ whole account of creation would not make two of those pages; indeed, would not occupy as much space as the “table of

contents" of Dana's book. For this reason Moses' statements must be general in their character, avoiding all detail, and he must confine himself rigidly to such facts as properly belong to a sacred history of creation.

3. The history of creation contained in Genesis claims to be a direct revelation from God—when and to whom made we do not know—an *errorless* record of which was secured by the inspiration of Moses. Now, the Scriptures tell us that inspired prophets often very imperfectly understood the revelations made through them. (1 Pet. i. 10, 11.) In the highest sense of the expression, God God and not the prophet is the author of the communication, not only as to its substance, but even as to the very words which the Holy Ghost has taught him to use. (1 Cor. ii. 13.) For this reason it is evidently improper to make Moses' understanding of the record he was inspired to write, or the knowledge of nature possessed in Moses' day, our standard for interpreting this portion of Genesis, as some have seemed disposed to do.

4. The Scriptures were intended for all men, "the common people" as well as scholars, and are therefore written in the language of common life, a language in which things are spoken of as they appear. The astronomer, in his intercourse with his fellow men, speaks of the sun's rising and setting, though he well knows that the motion of the sun is apparent, and not real. The physicist speaks of the dew falling, though he knows that each drop is formed by condensation at the point at which it appears. This peculiarity of the language of Scripture was first pointed out by Galileo, when defending the Copernican system of astronomy against the charge of contradicting the plain testimony of the Word of God, and though controverted for a time, is now accepted as beyond question by all thoughtful men.

Bearing these facts in mind, turn we now to an examination of the Pentateuchal history of creation. For reasons which will appear in the course of the examination, I shall divide the record into three parts, viz.: (1), The introduction (Gen. i. 1); (2), The history down to the creation of man (Gen. i. 2-25); and (3), The creation of man, male and female (Gen. i. 26-31, and ii. 1-7, 18-25).

PART I.—THE INTRODUCTION.

I. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth."
(Gen. i. 1.)

There is no single word in the Hebrew language equivalent to our English word *universe*. The phrase, "the heaven and the earth," is the nearest equivalent to it, and is here doubtless used to signify the whole material system of which our earth forms a part; the sun, the planets and their satellites, and the fixed stars with all that belongs to them. The eminent Jewish commentators, Aben Ezra and Maimonides, concur with learned christian writers in so understanding it.

The Hebrew word here rendered "create" does not always mean "to make out of nothing;" indeed, in so far as I know, there is no word in any language which has invariably such a meaning. But that it has that meaning here is evident from the whole subsequent context, as well as from the express teaching of Scripture in Heb. xi. 3: "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear."

"In the beginning," *i. e.*, when the heaven and the earth began to exist. Intending to teach the eternity of the Word, John writes, with evident reference to the use of the expression here, "In the beginning was the Word" (Jno. i. 1); *i. e.*, when the heaven and the earth began to be, the Word was already in existence.

II. In this brief introductory declaration, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," we are taught: (1), the existence of God, in refutation of Atheism; (2), the existence of one, and but one, God, in refutation of Polytheism; (3), the creation of matter by God, in refutation of a common postulate of Materialism; and (4), the existence of God apart from and prior to the universe in all its parts, in refutation of Pantheism. Considering the Scriptures as the word of God, intended to teach the true religion, they contain no weightier sentence than this, and we can conceive of none which would form a more appropriate introduction to a sacred history of creation.

III. The testimony of science, in so far as it is competent to

speak at all respecting the matter, is in perfect harmony with this declaration of Moses. On the main point presented, Prof. Huxley writes:

"It appears to me that the scientific investigator is wholly incompetent to say anything at all about the first origin of the material universe. The whole power of his organon vanishes when he steps beyond the chain of natural causes and effects."—*Order of Creation*, p. 153.

1. That the universe had a beginning, however, as Moses affirms, science unequivocally testifies. Prof. Tait writes:

"All portions of our science," *i. e.*, physics, "and especially that beautiful one, the dissipation of energy, point unanimously to a beginning; to a state of things incapable of being derived by present laws of tangible matter and its energies from any conceivable previous arrangement."—*Recent Advance in Physical Science*, p. 26.

And Prof. Langley, speaking of the sun, the great central body of the system to which our earth belongs, writes:

"We may say, with something like awe at the meaning to which science points, that the whole past of the sun cannot have been over eighteen millions of years, and its whole future radiation cannot last so much more. Its probable life is covered by about thirty million years."—*The Century Magazine for December*, 1884.

2. The universe is not the product of chance. Astronomy testifies to a wonderful order pervading the universe, mathematical in its accuracy in so far as the bodies astronomy has to deal with are concerned. Zoölogy and botany testify to an equally wonderful order prevailing throughout the kingdom of organic nature, a wonderful adaptation of living creatures to their environments, and of the parts and organs of these living creatures to their functions, utterly inconsistent with their being the product of chance. Respecting the very atoms of which all bodies are believed to be made up, Sir John Herschel remarks: "They possess all the characteristics of manufactured articles."

PART II.—THE HISTORY DOWN TO THE CREATION OF MAN.

In his history Moses divides the time occupied by God in his work of creation into days. Before entering upon the particular examination of the portion of the history now before us, let us fix, if we can, the sense in which he uses that word.

The Imperial Dictionary gives us, as definitions of the English word day: (1), That part of the time of the earth's revolution on its axis in which its surface is presented to the sun; (2), the whole time or period of one revolution of the earth on its axis, or twenty-four hours, called the natural day; (3), time specified; any period of time distinguished from other time; age. The Hebrew word יום here rendered day, is used in Scripture in all three of these senses. Instances of its use in the last-mentioned sense we have in Ps. xcv. 8-10: "As in the day of temptation in the wilderness: when your fathers tempted me, proved me, and saw my work. Forty years long was I grieved with this generation,"—where "the day" was a period of forty years, characterized by Israel's temptation of God; and in Zechariah xiii. 1: "In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness,"—where "that day" covers the whole period of the christian dispensation, characterized by the free offer of salvation made to all men. And in this very account of creation, Moses unquestionably uses it in this sense when he writes: "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens" (Gen. ii. 4), where "the day" covers the whole period occupied by God in his work of creation, the whole age or era of creation, previously spoken of as made up of six days.

In attempting to determine in which of the two last-mentioned senses, for the record itself excludes the first-mentioned, excepting in verse 5, "And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night," Moses uses the word when he writes, "And there was evening and there was morning, one day—a second day," etc., I would ask the reader's attention to the following considerations:

1. If by age or era we mean a portion of time distinguishable from other time by something characteristic of it, and this is the sense in which geologists use these terms when they speak of "the age of mammals," "the carboniferous era," then Moses' days, whatever may have been their length, were ages or eras in the proper sense of those terms, as every one of them is characterized by some peculiar work.

2. Failing to take proper account of the poetical character of David's words, "For he spake and it was done; he commanded and it stood fast" (Ps. xxxiii. 9), and conceiving of creation as an instantaneous act, as the older commentators did, it is not surprising that they, without exception, understood the word day to mean a period of twenty-four hours. But, conceiving of the creation of which Moses tells us as a work, made up of many acts, and extending over six days, whatever the length of those days may have been, and considering the stupendous character of that work—nothing less than the creation of a world—it seems to me more reasonable to understand the days he speaks of to be periods of longer duration than twenty-four hours.

3. The creation-work of God on the sixth day, as given us in Gen. i. 24–28, was two-fold; (1), causing "the earth to bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle and creeping thing and beast of the earth after his kind;" and (2), "making man, male and female, in his own image." In Gen. ii. 7–25, there is a more particular account of the last-mentioned of these works; in which we are told, (1), of the making of man, as to his body, out of the dust of the ground, and then breathing into his nostrils the breath of life; (2), of God's planting a garden in Eden, and causing to grow out of the ground every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food, and then placing man therein to dress it and keep it; (3), of his entering into a covenant of life with man on condition of perfect obedience; (4), of his bringing every beast of the field and fowl of the air to Adam that he might name them; and when there was found no "help meet for him" among them all, (5), of his causing a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and as he slept, of his taking one of his ribs which he made a woman, and bringing her to the man, instituting the marriage relation between them. Now, it cannot be denied that all these things might have been done in the latter half of a day of twenty-four hours; but we get, I think, a far more natural interpretation if we understand the sixth day to have been a longer period than that.

4. The seventh day is characterized (1) by God's "resting from all his work which he created and made," and (2) by God's "blessing the day and sanctifying it." The rest here spoken of is simply

rest from his work of creation, not rest from all activity; for his work of providence, *i. e.*, "his preserving and governing all his creatures and all their actions" is as truly a work of God as creation is; and this certainly continues to the present day. Of his work of providence our Lord said, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." (John v. 17.) Of God's "blessing the day and sanctifying, hallowing it," I remark, understanding the seventh day to be our present age, beginning with the creation of man and stretching on to the "day of judgment," God has unquestionably blessed and hallowed it, in the only sense in which time can be said to be hallowed, by the greatest of all his works, his work of redemption, and his "holy, wise, and powerful" work of providence subservient thereto. In the fourth commandment, God's example in "hallowing" the seventh day is held up to enforce a similar course of conduct on the part of man. The force and pertinency of this example do not depend upon the length of the day, but upon its relation to other days. It is not as the seventh *day*, but as the *seventh* day, it furnishes us an example. For man it may well be a period of twenty-four hours, whilst for God, to whom "a thousand years are as one day, and one day as a thousand years," (2 Peter iii. 8,) it is an age or era.

5. It is worthy of particular remark, that in Moses' history the record of each of the first six days closes with the words, "and there was evening and there was morning, one day—a second day, a third day," etc., whilst in the case of the seventh day there is no such record. From this it would seem that the seventh day had not yet closed when Moses wrote. If the days of creation were days of twenty-four hours, the seventh day must have closed long before that time; but if we understand them to be eras or ages, the seventh of these ages characterized by God's resting from his work of creation, and hallowing the age by his greater work of redemption, the day has not yet come to a close. That God will eventually resume his work of creation, and John's vision be realized, the vision in which he "saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away," (Rev. xxi. 1,) I have no doubt; and that God's great work of redemption will have been completed when this shall occur, I think the Scrip-

tures clearly teach us. If this be so, then, and not till then, will the seventh day come to a close, and the record be made, "and there was evening and there was morning," a seventh day.

For all these reasons, reasons which present themselves on a careful examination of the record, my conclusion is that the word day in Moses' history of creation is to be understood in the sense of an age or era—a long period of time, how long I cannot pretend to say, distinguished from other time by something characteristic of it. The geologist, giving us the history of creation as he has learned it from the study of the rock-records of the earth, divides that history into eras in no way discrepant with those so distinctly marked in the Pentateuchal story.

I. Turning now to a particular examination of the portion of Moses' history I have designated as Part II., I shall make use of the New Version, as confessedly more accurate than the old.

1. "And the earth was waste and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the Spirit of God moved upon [was brooding upon, marginal] the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light: and there was light. And God saw the light that it was good; and God divided the light from the darkness. And God called the light day, and the darkness he called night. And there was evening and there was morning, one day." (Vs. 2-5.)

We have here the earth—not the universe, but the earth "individualized," to use the language of science—in a chaotic condition, in darkness, and the Spirit of God brooding upon this chaos, *i. e.*, beginning to evoke organization and life in the mass; as a fowl, by brooding upon her eggs, accomplishes that result. Then, God is represented as saying, "Let there be light." It is not said that then God made or created light, but that he said, "Let there be light," *i. e.*, let light be, visibly, sensibly. And he "divided the light from the darkness." The introduction of light upon the hitherto dark surface of the chaotic earth, and that in such a way that day and night should alternate with one another, is the characteristic work of the first day.

2. "And God said, Let there be a firmament [expanse, marginal] in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters. And God made the firmament, and divided the wa-

ters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament; and it was so. And God called the firmament heaven. And there was evening and there was morning, a second day." (Vs. 6-8.)

The translation of the Hebrew רָקִיעַ here by the English word firmament is now universally admitted to be an erroneous translation. It is copied from the Septuagint *στερέωμα*, and the Vulgate *firmamentum*, both of which words convey the idea of something solid. This is probably one of those errors of translation which must be traced to the mistaken science of the day when the Septuagint and Vulgate versions were made; a science which taught that the heavenly bodies were all fixed in crystal spheres. The proper translation is that given in the margin of the New Version, "expanse." God's separating between the waters on the surface of the earth and those suspended in the upper air, separating the one from the other just as the clouds are separated from the ocean and seas, by a clear expanse, was the characteristic work of the second day.

3. "And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear; and it was so. And God called the dry land earth; and the gathering together of the waters called he seas. And God saw that it was good. And God said, Let the earth put forth grass, herb yielding seed, and fruit tree bearing fruit after its kind, wherein is the seed thereof, upon the earth; and it was so. And the earth brought forth grass, herb yielding seed after its kind, and tree bearing fruit, wherein is the seed thereof, after its kind; and God saw that it was good. And there was evening and there was morning, a third day." (Vs. 9-13.)

The work characteristic of the third day was: (1,) God's causing the dry land to emerge from the waters, which up to this time had covered the whole surface of the earth, and then (2,) causing the earth to put forth grass, herbs, and trees; *i. e.*, plants of the three great classes in which the ancients arranged terrestrial vegetation. Dr. Clarke, in his comments on this passage, remarks: "Fruit-trees are not to be understood here in the restricted sense in which the term is used among us; it signifies all trees, not only

those which bear fruit which may be applied to the use of men and cattle, but also those which had the power of propagating themselves by seed." In Ezekiel xvii. 23, the cedar is mentioned as a fruit-bearing tree. From the fact that God is here represented as addressing his command to the earth—the earth as a whole, and not to some particular part of it—it seems fair to infer that this original vegetable covering of the land was an abundant one; the era, an era of luxuriant vegetation. Here, as Prof. Huxley has pointed out, Moses speaks of land-plants alone. Neither here nor elsewhere does he say a word about algæ, the vegetation peculiar to the sea. These may have been made long before this, while the waters yet covered the whole surface of the earth; and, if geological research should prove that such was the fact, no discrepancy with Moses' history of creation would be established thereby.

4. "And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days and years; and let them be for lights in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth; and it was so. And God made the two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night; *he made* the stars also. And God set them in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth, and to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness; and God saw that it was good. And there was evening and there was morning, a fourth day." (Vs. 14–19.)

The characteristic work of the fourth day is God's causing the sun, moon and stars to be, *i. e.*, visibly, sensibly to be, in the heavens, and to begin their appointed task of ruling over the day and the night; causing the change in the seasons, and marking the passage of days and years. Moses does not say that God created the sun, moon and stars on this fourth day. He has already said in verse 1: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," which, as we have seen, is the record of their creation; but, using the language of common life, which speaks of things as they appear to the senses, he says, "Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven," *i. e.*, let them now appear,

"and let them be for signs and for seasons, and for days and years."

5. "And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly [swarm with swarms, marginal] the moving creature that hath life, and let fowl fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven. And God created the great sea-monsters, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly, after their kinds, and every winged fowl after its kind; and God saw that it was good. And God blessed them, saying, Be fruitful, and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let fowl multiply in the earth. And there was evening and there was morning, a fifth day." (Vs. 20-23.)

The Hebrew עוף, here rendered fowl, means literally "flyers," and is of much wider signification than our English word fowl, and includes insects, *e. g.*, the locust, and flying mammals, *e. g.*, the bat. (Lev. xi. 19, 20.) Moses does not say that God first created these sea-creatures and flyers on this fifth day. Indeed, his language, "Let the waters swarm with swarms" of them, would suggest the idea that they were first created long before. What he does say, and all that he says when his language is strictly construed, is that on this fifth day there was a wonderful development of this portion of the animal kingdom. Should geological research establish the fact, as I think it has already done, that there were fishes and flyers long before this, there would be no discrepancy between Moses' account and geology established thereby. What Moses affirms respecting the fifth day is, that the characteristic feature of the creation-work of the day was a grand development of these classes of creatures; that the era was, emphatically, the era of great sea-monsters and flyers.

6. "And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after its kind, cattle and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after its kind; and it was so. And God made the beast of the earth after its kind, and the cattle after their kind, and everything that creepeth upon the ground after its kind; and God saw that it was good" (vs. 24, 25). Then follows an account of the creation of man, a work of this sixth day also.

When Moses writes, "And God said, Let the earth bring forth

the living creature after its kind, cattle and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after its kind," for reasons already given in studying the record of God's work on the third and fifth days, I understand him to teach simply that the sixth day was characterized by a special development of the classes of cattle, creeping things and wild beasts. The "creeping things" here mentioned are not reptiles, as the English reader would naturally suppose, but, "as they are grouped with the larger herbivorous cattle and the larger beasts of prey, it is probable that the term refers to the class of smaller land animals whose bodies are brought by means of short legs into close proximity to the earth."—*Bush on Genesis*. In Leviticus xi. 29, the weasel and the mouse are particularly mentioned as creeping things. If so, the three classes of animals here spoken of were all mammals, and this first part of the sixth day was, in the language of science, the age of mammals; and this Moses tells us immediately preceded the creation of man.

II. All these facts, thus stated by Moses, properly belong to a sacred history of creation; and the importance of the religious lessons they teach is abundantly illustrated in the subsequent history of our race. With the mass of mankind, idolatry is the form of false religion which has most widely supplanted the true.

1. In its earliest, purest condition, idolatry took the form of a worship of the heavenly bodies, especially of the sun and moon. To guard man against such idolatry as this, Moses tell us that all these heavenly bodies are the work of God's hands, and have been set by him in the heavens to give light upon the earth, to effect the change in the seasons and to mark the passage of time, not to be worshipped. Like man himself they are all God's creatures; man's ministers, not his lords.

2. A grosser form of idolatry, which has always succeeded the purer, is that in which man takes as his gods sea-monsters and birds of the air and beasts of the field. The crocodile, the ibis and the ox were all worshipped by the Egyptians, the most highly civilized nation on the face of the earth in Moses' day.

3. A still lower form of idolatry is that reproved by Isaiah in his words: "He heweth him down cedars, and taketh the cypress and the oak. . . . He burneth part thereof in the fire;

with part thereof he eateth flesh; he roasteth roast, and is satisfied; yea, he warmeth himself and saith, Aha, I am warm, I have seen the fire. And the residue thereof he maketh a god, even his graven image. He falleth down unto it, and prayeth unto it, and saith, Deliver me, for thou art my god." (Isa. xlv. 16, 10.) All this must have been known unto the God of Moses whose revelation this history of creation is; and intending it to furnish a refutation of idolatry in all its forms, it tells of God's creation of the cedar, the cypress and the oak; the sea-monsters, the birds and the beasts; and further, it tells us that when God made man in his own image, he gave him "dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." God made man their master, not them his.

A further religious use of this narrative is well expressed in the words of Hon. Mr. Gladstone:

"For the Adamic race, recent on the earth, and young in faculties, it has a natural and highly moral purpose in conveying to their minds a lively sense of the wise and loving care with which the Almighty Father, who demanded much at their hands, had beforehand given them much, in the providential adaptation of the world to be their dwelling-place, and of the created orders to their use and rule."—*Order of Creation*, p. 83.

Calling to mind the principle already laid down, that the Scriptures, being inspired of God, often use "words and phrases which, without suggesting puzzling enigmas, yet contain in themselves ample space for the demands of growing human knowledge," let the reader turn to Moses' record of God's work on the third day; his calling forth from the earth a wonderfully abundant vegetation—the carboniferous era of the geologist, as we must regard it—and he will see how appropriate such a record is to a sacred history of creation, if such record is intended to awaken in man gratitude to God his Creator. How clearly God's fatherly care for man appears in the fact that long ages before man was ready to use it, he laid up in the bowels of the earth the immense deposits of coal, now first beginning to be utilized, and so important a factor in our modern civilization.

III. Turn we now to an examination of the question, Is there any discrepancy between the statements of this sacred history of

creation, and the secular or profane history which the geologist has learned from his study of the "rock-records" of the earth?

This second part of the Mosaic record covers the same ground with geology. Both relate events belonging to the same period of the earth's history; though, because of the different purposes with which they have been written, not necessarily all the same events. In general, the two records are obviously in harmony. More especially is this the case in so far as organic nature is concerned; and it is just here that geological science is most certain of its facts and most thoroughly established in its propositions. But, passing from this general to a more particular examination of the Mosaic record, I ask the reader's attention to the following facts, viz.:

1. After stating that "in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," Moses tells us, in verse 2, that "the earth was waste and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep." This chaotic condition was that of the earth when God began the work described in the subsequent portions of this history. Whether it was its condition when first brought into being, or long ages intervened between "the beginning" of verse 1, and the condition of things described in verse 2, Moses does not tell us. Basil, Origen, Theodoret and Augustine believed that ages come in between verses 1 and 2, of which Moses says not a word. Should the nebular hypothesis, now in favor with many scientists, come to be established as scientific truth, there would be nothing in this at variance with Moses' history. The period which this hypothesis covers would be the period which comes in between verses 1 and 2. In verse 2, Moses begins with the earth completely "individualized," and no longer a part of any nebula.

2. The word chaos has long been in use among geologists, but with a very indefinite meaning. Recent discoveries, embodied in what is popularly styled "the New Astronomy," now, for the first time, enable us to understand what the true nature of chaos is. The sun and moon are bodies belonging to the same system with our earth, and the spectroscope has disclosed to us the fact that the sun, at least, is made up very much of the same elementary substances as the earth; and further, by means of the spectroscope and improved telescope, we learn that the sun is now in a condition

of chaos through the operation of intense heat. The earth bears many unmistakable marks of having once been in the condition in which the sun now is. And the moon also, according to the "New Astronomy," was once in this same condition. The sun, because of its immense mass—more than a million of times that of the earth—has thus far cooled comparatively little, although constantly radiating its heat into space. The moon, many thousand times smaller than the earth, has become completely solidified by cooling; whilst the earth, intermediate in mass between the sun and moon, occupies an intermediate position in temperature also. Taking now the present chaotic condition of the sun as the type of what was once the condition of the earth, we can attach a definite meaning to the word chaos as used by the geologist.

3. According to the "New Astronomy," the sun consists of (1,) a solid or quasi-solid central mass, intensely heated, but kept in a solid state by the immense pressure of its atmosphere; (2,) an atmosphere, many thousands of miles in thickness, composed largely of vaporized iron, zinc, calcium and other metals. This atmosphere is commonly spoken of as the sun's photosphere, because the immediate source of the light it sends to the earth; and (3,) what is called the chromosphere, a kind of second atmosphere, consisting entirely of free hydrogen, thousands of miles in thickness, and often shooting out mountain masses on its surface to an immense distance. All this has been learned by direct observation. These are facts of science, and not mere hypotheses. Through spectroscopic analysis I know that vaporized iron enters largely into the composition of the sun's atmosphere, as certainly as I do, through ordinary chemical analysis, that oxygen enters into the composition of the atmosphere of the earth.

4. Starting with the earth in the condition in which the sun now is, what must be the series of changes it will undergo as it cools, according to the well ascertained physical laws which govern all such cooling bodies? The first effect of cooling would be the precipitation of the vaporized metals and other heavy bodies upon its solid surface, and this in the condition of oxides, where the metal had such an affinity for oxygen, as iron and calcium have; and then, the disappearance of the chromosphere, through the combination of its hydrogen with oxygen in the formation of water. At

first, this water would be in the condition of vapor; and our earth would present the appearance of a solid sphere wrapped in an immense cloud of watery vapor. This, if I mistake not, was just the condition of our earth when Moses resumes his narrative in the words, "And the earth was waste and void," *i. e.*, without living plant or animal of any kind upon it, "and darkness was upon the face of the deep." (1.) As the cooling proceeded, the dense mass of vapor would thin out, so that it would be possible for light from the sun to penetrate to the more solid mass; and, in consequence of the revolution of the earth upon its axis, along with the entrance of light would come the alternation of day and night, as Moses describes it in verses 4, 5. (2.) To this would succeed, as the cooling went on, a condensation of a portion of the watery vapor in a liquid form upon the surface of the solid central mass, and a separation between it and the portion which would still remain suspended above it, just such a separation as now exists, and as Moses describes in verses 6-8. (3.) Then, as the cooling proceeded yet further, because of the contraction of the solidified crust of the earth, more rapidly than of the heated mass within, that crust would be rent and upheaved, so that the land would emerge from beneath the waters, and a division between the dry land and the sea would be effected. (See verses 9, 10.) After this, and not until then, would the sun, moon and stars appear in the heavens, and begin their work of distinctly marking the passage of days and years, as stated in verses 14-19.

5. Of organic nature, Moses tells us, that there was, first, a great outburst of vegetable life on the earth, a gigantic growth of land plants; and that this gigantic vegetation followed immediately upon, and was in part cotemporary with, the separation of land and water; for so I understand his representing these two works as both occurring on the same creative day. Then, second, that God caused the waters to swarm with swarms of sea monsters, and the air with birds (flyers); and, after this of an outburst of mammal life upon the land, "of cattle, and wild beasts and creeping things." Now, what are these three eras in the creation of organic nature but "the carboniferous era," the age of gigantic sauria and monstrous birds (flyers), including the pterodactyles, and the age of mammals, of the geologist. In Moses' record these ages are the

same in number, and they occur in the same order they do in the record of geology.

6. On one point which the Mosaic record decides definitely, geology does not give so decided an answer, viz.: that the carboniferous era preceded the distinct appearance of the sun in the heavens. And yet, all that geology does say is favorable to Moses' decision. The leading classes of plants which make up the mass of the coal of the carboniferous era are mosses, ferns and gigantic lepidodendra, plants which to-day flourish in a damp atmosphere and in the shade, and are dwarfed, if not killed, by direct sunshine. And in addition to this, the numerous seams of coal, separated by seams of slate, and even sandstone, in these older coal-fields, tell of frequent subsidence and emergence of the land during their formation: just the condition of things we would expect to find, when the land was being separated from the water.

7. That the warm waters of the primeval ocean, before the land emerged, contained algæ (sea-weeds), and some of the lower forms of animals, *e. g.*, the eozoon, polyps and radiates, is, I think, pretty clearly established. That there were certain kinds of fish in the sea, and flyers such as insects in the air, before and throughout the carboniferous era, I have no doubt. But in all this I see nothing at variance with the Mosaic record. Of the creation of all these creatures we are told in Genesis ii. 1, and yet more definitely in Exodus xx. 11; "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is," but of the exact time of their creation we are told nothing. In a history of creation written for the purpose with which Moses wrote, why should he mention them? In so brief a history, how could he mention them? That sauria, and birds and mammals—air-breathing animals—could not have lived upon the land, or in the air, before the gigantic vegetation of the carboniferous era had purified the atmosphere by decomposing the vast quantity of carbonic acid it must have contained, fixing its carbon, and giving back its oxygen, no scientist will question; and this all that Moses' history fairly implies.

PART III.—THE CREATION OF MAN, MALE AND FEMALE.

"And the Lord said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and

over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. And God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them; and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it, and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth. . . . And God saw everything that he had made, and behold it was very good. And there was evening and there was morning, the sixth day." (Gen. i. 26-31.) Such is the general account which Moses gives us of the creation of man. In chapter ii., as a part of the sad story of the introduction of sin into our world, he gives us certain other particulars, in his words, "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul [literally, a creature of life or living creature.] . . . And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and he slept; and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof; and the rib which the Lord God took from the man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man. And the man said, This is now bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh." (Gen. ii. 7, 21-24.)

I. That this portion of the Mosaic record is to be understood as neither parable nor myth, but a piece of plain history, a record of facts, is placed beyond all doubt by the way in which it is subsequently referred to in the Scriptures. Thus, Paul writes: "For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man." (1 Cor. xi. 8, 9.) And our Lord says, "Have ye not read, that he which made them in the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." (Matt. xix. 5, 6.)

In this history of the creation of man the following particulars

are clearly set forth, viz.: (1,) That man was the last made of God's creatures, his making finishing the work of creation in so far as our earth is concerned. (2,) That he was made in the very "image and likeness of God," and to him was given "dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." (3,) That, departing from the course pursued in the case of the lower animals, God made but one human pair. In the language of Moses—and in this the language of Scripture is the language of science—God made "man, male and female," thus securing for man, in all coming time, a perfect race-unity. (4,) That God made man and woman separately; the man first, as to his body, "of the dust of the ground;" the woman afterwards, as to her body, from the rib of the man; that thus there might be established between them a peculiarly intimate relation, expressed by Adam in his words, "This is now bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh."

II. Do these facts properly belong to a sacred history of creation? In attempting to answer this question, I would ask the reader to notice (1,) That, without the account which Moses gives us of man's creation "in the image and likeness" of God, we could not understand the Scripture explanation of the great problem which confronts us the moment we turn to the study of man's present condition and his present relation to God his Creator; a problem expressed by Rousseau in his words, "Our humanity is deeply tainted with some sore and irrecoverable disease." (2,) The unity of the human race is a fundamental fact in the philosophy of the plan of salvation made known to us in Paul's words, "As by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so, by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." (Rom. v. 18-19.) (3,) "Marriage was ordained for the mutual help of husband and wife; for the increase of mankind with a legitimate issue, and of the church with a holy seed; and for preventing uncleanness." (*Confession of Faith*, Chap. xxiv.) And one of the precepts of the moral law, as written by the finger of God upon tables of stone, is a prohibition of all disregard of its sacred obligations. Hence the church

has always recognized the religious character of marriage. A record, then, of the fact that in the creation of man and woman God gave a solemn sanction to the marriage relation, is an appropriate part of a sacred history of creation.

III. What has science to say on these several points presented in this portion of the Mosaic record?

1. As to man's being the last made of God's creatures, "The evidence of geology has always been that among all the creatures which have in succession been formed to live upon the earth and enjoy it, man is the latest born. This great fact is still the fundamental truth in the history of creation. . . . So far as we yet know, no new form of life has been created since the highest form was made."—*Argyll's Primeval Man*, p. 113.

It is further worthy of remark that Moses makes the outburst of mammal life upon the earth and the creation of man two separate works of creation wrought on the same (the sixth) day. Interpreting this as I have interpreted a similar record of the work on the third day, it would indicate that these two works were in part cotemporary, *i. e.*, in the language of geology, that the closing portion of the age of mammals overlapped the earlier part of the age of man. On this point Dr. Southall writes:

"The mammoth was in Siberia down to the inauguration of that cold climate characteristic of that region. This was *after* the glacial period in Europe, probably at the close of the glacial period in Sweden and Scotland. When France and England were occupied by the cave-man, Siberia was enjoying, at least the middle and southern portion of it, a comparatively temperate climate, and was inhabited by a bronze-using people, who were skilful workers in that metal; the mammoth, the rhinoceros, and the megaceros ranging in its forests."—*Recent Origin of Man*, p. 518.

2. Moses tells us that man was made "in the image and likeness" of God, and to him was given "dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." On this point Prof. Dana writes:

"In the appearance of man, the system of life, in progress through the ages, reached its completion, and the animal structure its highest perfection. Another higher is not within the range of our conception. For the vertebrate type, which began during the paleozoic, in the prone or horizontal fish, becomes erect in man, and thus completes, as Agassiz has observed, the possible changes in the series to its last term. An erect body and an erect forehead admit of no step beyond. But besides this, man's whole structure declares his intellectual and spiritual nature. His forelimbs are not organs of locomotion, as they are in all other mammalians;

they have passed from the *locomotive* to the *cephalic* series, being made to subserve the purposes of the head; and this transfer is in accordance with a grand law of nature, which is the basis of grade and development. The cephalization of the animal has been the goal of all progress; and in man we mark its highest possible triumph."—*Dana's Geology*, p. 578.

3. The unity of the human race, long and keenly debated, must now be considered a settled matter in science. Prof. Huxley writes:

"I cannot see any good ground, or even any tenable sort of evidence, for believing that there is more than one species of man."—*Origin of Species*, Lecture V.

And the Duke of Argyll:

"On this point, therefore, of the unity of man's origin, those who bow to the authority of the most ancient and most venerable traditions, and those who accept the most popular of modern scientific theories, are found standing on common ground and accepting the same result."—*Unity of Nature*, p. 399.

4. On the remaining point, viz.: God's making woman from the rib of man, and instituting the marriage relation, geology, from the nature of the case, can say nothing. The sacredness of the marriage relation, and so of the family, all history declares to be fundamental to civilization in its highest form, and with equal distinctness declares polygamy to be fatal to national prosperity. The marriage relation, such as Moses describes as instituted of God, is unknown among savages. It is only among the most highly civilized nations, and as the result of that civilization, that woman has recovered the rank and station which, according to Moses, God gave her in the beginning. These facts furnish a good and sufficient reason for departure from the common order of creation in the case of woman. Certainly the story is a very strange invention, if it be an invention, on the part of a "semi-barbarous Hebrew," as Prof. Huxley would have us believe that Moses was. In the circumstances of the case, "the invention is more incredible than the fact."

CONCLUSION.

1. I have now gone through with the history of creation given us in the opening portion of the Book of Genesis, continually bearing in mind the nature of that history as sacred, and not secular or profane; and guided in my interpretation of the record by the principle recognized by jurists as well as critics, that all docu-

ments must be interpreted with an especial reference to the object with which they have been written. A disregard of this plain principle of interpretation, if I mistake not, has given rise to much of the apparent discrepancy between Genesis and geology, which has perplexed christian scientists, and given occasion for such cavilling remarks, as that of Prof. Huxley, quoted at the opening of this article.

2. Respecting some of the facts stated by Moses, science has nothing to say, and this for the good and sufficient reason that they are beyond its purview—*e. g.*, the original creation of matter, and the peculiar manner in which woman was made. Of many of the facts ascertained by science, Moses says nothing for a similar reason; *e. g.*, the time at which organic life first appeared upon the earth, and the creation of the lower orders of plants and animals. This is just what, in the circumstances of the case, we have a right to expect; just what we find to be true of the Bible story throughout. In the Scripture story of Adam, we are told of his creation, his probation in Eden, and his fall—all events which must have occurred during the first years, possibly the first year, of his life; but of the remainder of that life of nine hundred and thirty years nothing is said. Of the first eighty years of Moses' life the Scriptures tell us of nothing except the wondrous providence which in his early infancy placed him in the household of Pharaoh, and then of his flight from Egypt when forty years of age. Of the histories of Egypt and Babylon and Rome the Scriptures tell us something, where those histories touch upon the history of redemption, and what they do tell us is being confirmed in a most remarkable manner by modern research; but of all the remainder of the histories of those empires they have nothing to say. Because of this, no reasonable man imagines any discrepancy between the Bible history and the histories of Manetho or Berosus or Livy.

3. In the Pentateuchal story of creation certain facts are stated, viz.: (1), the creation by God, in the beginning, of the heaven and the earth; (2), the chaotic condition of the earth when God began the work of evoking order and organization; (3), the entrance of light, and the succession of day and night before the sun could be seen; (4), the separation of the waters under the heavens from

those above it; (5), the emergence of the land from beneath the surface of the waters; (6), a gigantic outburst of vegetation upon the land; (7), the distinct appearance of the sun, moon and stars, the unveiling of nature's great clock by which the passage of time has been noted ever since; (8), an era of gigantic sea-monsters and birds (flyers); (9), an era of gigantic mammals; followed immediately by, (10), the creation of man, male and female, as the last and crowning work of creation; and then, (11), God's rest from his work of creation, a rest which continues to the present day. This is, in substance, all that Moses says, and it is all that it was appropriate for him to say in a sacred history of creation, all that it was possible for him to say in so brief a history as that he has given us. Science, especially geology, has made rapid and substantial progress in the last fifty years, and in our day for the first time is competent to testify on some of the points mentioned above; and now that its "tongue is unloosed," its testimony distinctly confirms the Pentateuchal story as summarized above in every particular; and I would ask the readers especially to notice that it is not geological theory, but well ascertained geological facts, which confirm the statements of fact made by Moses.

4. On the one point which yet remains for consideration, viz.: the claim which the Pentateuchal story of creation makes to be a revelation from God, I cannot do better than quote the words of Hon. Wm. E. Gladstone:

"How came Moses . . . to possess knowledge which natural science has only within the present century for the first time dug out of the bowels of the earth? It is surely impossible to avoid the conclusion, first, that either he was gifted with faculties passing all human experience, or else his knowledge was divine. The first branch of the alternative is truly nominal and unreal. We know the sphere within which human inquiry toils. We know the heights to which the intuitions of genius may soar. We know that in certain cases genius anticipates science; as Homer, for example, in his account of the conflict of the four winds in the sea-storm. But even in these anticipations, marvellous and, so to speak, imperial as they are, genius cannot escape from an inexorable law. It must have materials of sense and experience to work with, and a *pou sto* from which to take its flight; and genius can no more tell, apart from some at least of the results attained by inquiry, what are the contents of the crust of the earth, than it could square the circle or annihilate a fact. So stands a plea for a revelation of truth from God, a plea only to be met by questioning its possibility, that is, . . . by suggesting that a being able to make man is unable to communicate with the creature he has made."—*Order of Creation*, pp. 25, 26.

GEO. D. ARMSTRONG.

II. THE MIRACLE, THE PRINCIPLE OF UNITY IN THE EVIDENCES OF A DIVINE REVELATION.

It is necessary that a revelation claiming to be supernatural and divine should be authenticated by proofs of the most extraordinary and indisputable character. Such proofs of the revelation contained in the Bible God has furnished in the form of miracles.

A miracle we have defined to be a wonderful event, contravening some known law or laws of the course of nature, physical, mental or moral, and accompanying the teaching of a person claiming to be commissioned by God, or a revelation professing to be divine and intended to promote human holiness.

If such an event can be proved as a fact, the inference is necessary that it is produced by the immediate efficiency of God; for, either it is produced by man, or by evil spirits, or by God. It could not be produced by man, for he cannot contravene the known laws of nature. It could not be by evil spirits, for they would not attempt to authenticate teaching designed to promote holiness; and, further, as Dr. Wardlaw has argued, since the Bible claiming to be a divine revelation furnishes the only information men possess concerning the existence and agency of præter-human spirits, it is illegitimate for its assailant to employ that information for the purpose of disproving its claim. He would involve himself in the contradiction of admitting the trustworthiness of the revelation, the trustworthiness of which it is his design to overthrow. The only remaining supposition would consequently be established, namely, that the event is produced by God; and, since it contravenes the known laws of nature, by the immediate efficiency of God. The conclusion is, that as God cannot be a party to a fraud, or sanction imposture, the commission or revelation accompanied by such an event is proved to be divine. The office of the miracle as a credential—its apologetic worth—becomes apparent.

Let it be observed, that the miracle is not said to be inconsistent with what Bishop Butler calls “the original plan of things,” but

with the known laws of that natural system with which we are familiar. Nothing short of this could yield incontestable proof of God's interposition. A consideration of the objections to this definition, urged by all sorts of parties from the atheist to the christian theologian has required a separate discussion. But some of the positive proofs by which it is supported will, in the course of the following remarks, be presented in connexion with the several branches of the evidence in favor of divine revelation, as they shall come to be specially examined.

Following the course suggested in the introduction to this discussion, in the last number of the QUARTERLY, we proceed to show that—

II. All the different kinds of evidence in favor of the divine origin of the supernatural revelation contained in the Bible are, in the main, reducible to unity upon the miracle: that is to say, that they are all, so far as their principal features are concerned, miraculous in the sense of that term which has just been explained, as signifying not only what is wonderful and supernatural, but also what is contra-natural.

These evidences are divisible into three classes: the external, the internal, and the experimental.

We will not stop to vindicate this distribution. The classification, as a whole, is very generally adopted, and will upon examination be found logically complete; while each separate generalization—the external, the internal, and the experimental—is based upon a competent induction of particulars exhibiting specifically characteristic features. Let it be borne in mind, that it is not now intended to furnish a condensed treatise upon the evidences, but to consider them with special reference to the question whether they are miraculous in their character. All that is necessary, therefore, to the end had in view is to emphasize specimen examples of each class.

1. Let us begin with the external evidences. These may be subdivided into prophecy, miracles of external fact, and the effects attending the propagation of Christianity.

(1.) The first of these which must be considered is prophecy. It is a miracle of knowledge, and as such contravenes a known

law, operating universally upon the human intelligence—the law of limitation upon the scope of the mental powers. It is not designed to affirm that it contradicts the essential elements of the human mind and the laws in accordance with which they operate, such as consciousness, conception, and the reasoning faculty, the ability to receive testimony, the contents of which may be incomprehensible by the recipient, and to express it in intelligible language. With these powers and their laws prophecy, in a sense, falls in and pre-supposes them. But it contravenes the law by which these powers with their laws are limited, so that certain kinds of knowledge become impossible to the human mind, in itself considered as acting by virtue of its own energies. Under this law of limitation falls the inability of man to foretell a large and important section of future events.

The prediction of events which may be expected to occur in accordance with the fixed laws of the physical world is not prophecy, strictly speaking; at least, it is not the kind of prophecy which constitutes one prominent feature of the evidences in favor of a divine, supernatural revelation. It is the result of common sagacity. The uniform operation of such laws grounds all ordinary effort, and justifies all temporal schemes and enterprises involving hope for the future. If a man had foretold a month ago that the sun would rise to-day, that would not entitle him to prophetic honors; but if he had then predicted that the sun would *not* rise to-day, and it had so happened, a terror-stricken world would recognize him as a prophet. It is the prediction of contingent events—that is, those which, contemplated from a finite point of view, may or may not occur, the futurity of which the operation of no known law guarantees, especially events conditioned by the free action of the human or the divine will,—it is this which is properly denominated prophecy. The prediction of such events transcends and contravenes the clearly established law of limitation under which the processes of the human intelligence take place.

How strikingly is this evinced by the prophecies of Isaiah and Jeremiah touching the capture of Babylon! In their day it was a magnificent city, said to have been surrounded with massive walls, which, according to Herodotus and Ctesias, were about three hun-

dred feet high, and to have contained one hundred brazen gates. The area enclosed, in the judgment of recent scholars, was much greater than that occupied by the enormous city of London. Some generations before its fall one of these sacred writers named Cyrus as its conqueror, another described the mode in which it was taken, in the midst of a drunken revelry, and both detailed some of the circumstances that preceded and attended its surprising doom. All this was confirmed by the accounts of profane historians. And Isaiah, gifted with a vision of the distant future of this great city, adds a description of its final condition as that of a tangled morass, infested by reptiles and beasts of prey, which would prevent the Arabian from pitching his tent or shepherds from folding their flocks upon its site.

The prophet Ezekiel, after graphically painting the glories of Tyre, the beautiful empress of the Eastern Mediterranean, with her fabulous wealth, her merchant princes, her skilled artisans, her commerce reaching out in every direction, to the Caspian Sea, to the Euphrates, to Arabia, to the Persian Gulf, and to the Peloponnesus and the distant Pillars of Hercules, puts the finishing stroke to the gorgeous picture by representing the successive degradations through which she should descend, until at last she should be "a place to spread nets upon," and should "be built no more."

The same prophet, in describing the doom of Egypt, once among the most splendid kingdoms on the face of the earth, the seat of philosophy, science and learning which attracted the sages of Greece, uses these remarkable words, "There shall be no more a prince of the land of Egypt."

Travellers and explorers now tell us that on the site of Babylon the roaming Bedouin does not venture to pitch his tent, nor the nomadic shepherd to fold his flocks. They inform us that Tyre is a pitiful town where poor fishermen spread their nets. History attests that, for two thousand years, Egypt has had no autonomy. It has been successively ruled by the Babylonians, the Persians, the Macedonians, the Romans, the Saracens, the Mamelukes, and the Turks. Look at her to-day. Our current newspapers tell us that she is a bone of contention to the European powers. She has no native ruler—no prince of her own.

How could Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel have known these future facts? It is supremely preposterous to say that they lived after their occurrence, or that the prophecies were simply interpolated histories. How did they know these distant events? The law which limited their faculties rendered the knowledge impossible to them, and, it may be added, to any præter-human finite intelligences. What solution of the mystery can be given, but that the omniscient Being who knows by an unchanging intuition the past, the present and the future, traversed that law of limitation by his immediate efficiency, and produced this contra-natural miracle of knowledge?

These instances, selected from a numerous class, suffice to show that the evidence derived from prophecy in favor of divine revelation is miraculous, in the sense that a universal and clearly established law is contravened—the law of limitation upon the mental powers, which renders impossible their knowledge of future events conditioned upon the free acts of the will.

To say that there is here simply the introduction of a new antecedent, in accordance with which a new mental result is attained, is to confess that, as a novel and unexpected force is employed, not provided for in the constitution of the human mind, the known laws of its operation are contravened. To take the ground that the immediate efficiency of God is that new antecedent is to give up the question; for it is absurd to treat the divine causality, which underlies and pervades all second causes, as a special force and to coördinate it with the special forces of nature. It is in the case of prophecy, as in all other miracles, exerted in a wholly extraordinary and contra-natural manner. To maintain that it is employed in consistency with higher laws is to shift the issue; for the constitution of things with which we are familiar alone can be considered a legitimate field of evidence. What is higher and by us unknowable cannot possibly be a valid element of evidence. And it must be remembered that the question before us is concerned about the evidence in favor of a divine revelation.

(2.) The next special class of evidences consists of what we have denominated miracles of external fact—works wrought in the phenomenal sphere and appealing to the bodily senses. What we

shall attempt to show is that they were contra-natural—that they infringed some known laws of the physical system. Let us take, for the sake of illustration, two examples, one from the Old Testament, the other from the New:

One of the sons of the prophets, under the tuition of the illustrious Elisha, was felling a tree on the bank of the Jordan, when the axe flew from the helve and sunk into the river. It was held at the bottom in accordance with the law of gravitation. Now, had the axe been fished up, or had the young man dived and brought it up, the law of gravitation would have been counteracted, but there would have been no miracle. The iron rose and floated upon the surface, without the employment of any such natural force. The law which was contradicted was, that iron will not rise to the surface of water unless some physical force counteract and overcome that of gravity. That is the law; and it is established upon an induction of innumerable particulars. That law was, in this instance, violated, for the iron rose to the surface and swam without the use of any natural force. According to the laws of nature merely it could not have floated. They were not only transcended, but contravened. God palpably sealed the prophet's commission.

Consider next the resurrection of Lazarus from the dead. If there be a law which has been established by an induction of facts it is that of the immobility of the dead body without the application of extraneous force. No dead man voluntarily moves and resumes the functions of life. In this case, without the employment of physical force, the corpse of Lazarus, in obedience simply to a command of Christ, moved and came forth from the sepulchre still strapped by the linen bandages with which it had been interred. Was not the law of the absence of voluntary mobility from the dead body absolutely contradicted? This must be admitted, if the propositions, A corpse is not able to move voluntarily; a corpse is able to move voluntarily, are allowed to be contradictory.

Take another view of this transparently simple case. It is a universal law—except when a miracle of resurrection occurs—that a dead man continues to be dead. But this man, Lazarus, did not

continue to be dead. Did not the act of Christ by which he ceased to be dead contradict the law that the dead remain dead? If not, there are no such things as contradictories. Every bodily sense was constituted a witness that the law of death was contravened, and the contradictory law of life established. The eye-sight of the transported sisters, for did they not see him hobbling out to light? their hearing, did not his voice once more salute their ears? their touch, did they not clasp him in their arms? their smell, was he any more offensive? their very taste, for did they not imprint fond kisses upon his now warm lips?—all attested the phenomenal miracle by which the law of death had been violated, and the law of life substituted in its room.

(3.) The third species of the external evidences which we shall here emphasize is the effects which flowed from the propagation of Christianity.

In the first place, survey the forces against which Christianity as an infantile system had to contend—Judaism, false, apostate, intensely bigoted and supporting itself by the consecrated traditions of the past; Paganism, as a religion pervading the multitudinous Gentile nations, and consolidated by the sentiments and usages of centuries; Greek philosophy, the queen of human speculation, the climax of subtle intellectualism; the secular power of Rome, whose invincible legions had made her the imperial mistress of the known world; and, more than all this formidable array of opposition, the natural passions of men. Each christian confronted the probability of his becoming a holocaust, each church of being made a hecatomb.

In the second place, notice the extreme feebleness of its human resources for so gigantic a conflict. Its propagators, with the exception of Paul, were unlettered: there was no appeal to learning or philosophy. They were physically powerless: there was no appeal to the sword or to civil authority. They were poor: there was no appeal to wealth. They were few: there was no appeal to numbers.

In the third place, contemplate the antecedent improbability of success arising from the nature of the religion to be propagated. Its great law was self-denial: the cross was marked into the heart

of its adherents. Its promise for this world was tribulation: its rewards were postponed to a future state. Faith, not sense nor carnal reason, was its principle of action, its motive to exertion. It was characterized by utter simplicity: it had no outward pomp, no magnificent temples, no gorgeous ritual, no smoking altars, and no vested priests.

In the fourth place, consider the antecedent improbability of success springing from the means of its propagation. This was preaching—the foolishness of preaching salvation from sin, death and hell through faith in a crucified man; of preaching to the Jews salvation by one whom they had handed over to the Romans to be executed; of preaching to the Romans salvation by one whom a procurator had sentenced to the ignominious death of a felon and a slave.

In the fifth place, observe its marvellous success in the teeth of these accumulated and apparently insuperable difficulties. Without an appeal to learning or philosophy, without the sword or civil patronage, without pecuniary resources, and without numbers in the inception of its career, apostolic Christianity ere long triumphed over every obstacle and pushed its spiritual conquests into regions which the Roman armies had never pierced. And now that the spirit of an apostolic propagandism has revived, the Apocalyptic angel flies mid-heaven with the everlasting gospel, and Christianity has secured what no other religion ever attained, a well-nigh universal dissemination—at least a representative existence in almost every nation, kindred, tribe and tongue of earth. It is leavening the masses of Paganism with its doctrine, erecting its missionary stations in the heart of a ferocious Mohammedanism, and planting the standard of the Cross in the blood of its martyrs amidst the central populations of the dark and barbarous continent.

It has suffered from great corruptions; it is suffering from them now, such is the tendency of our poor human nature to degeneracy from a pure religion; but notwithstanding this mournful fact, it has exerted, and is exercising, a meliorating influence upon human society. It humanizes its civilization, refines its institutions, and despite the desperate attempts of David Hume and

materialistic sceptics of the present day to show the contrary, it is advancing its moral condition. Among its fundamental and leading virtues, it crowns the heavenly grace of charity, and the tongue of slander itself cannot refuse to it the credit of erecting infirmaries and hospitals, asylums and refuges for the insane and unfortunate, and of carrying the banner of its beneficent ministrations into crashes of conflict and upon fields of blood.

Here, then, are miracles, stupendous miracles, accomplished not by human agency—that were impossible—but by the immediate efficiency of Almighty God, in the face of obstacles which would have been otherwise insurmountable. The truth is that Christianity, as a remedial scheme designed to achieve holiness and life, contradicts by its very genius and end the law of sin and death, and every step of its progress affords an instance of this contradiction. That progress depends upon the regeneration of sinners, and every regenerated soul is a monumental proof that the law of spiritual death has been violated and the law of spiritual life established.

To these considerations it may be added that the continuous existence of the church through all the vicissitudes of past ages is a standing miracle. How else is it to be accounted for, that having been a contemporary of the mighty organizations of the world, and having been often brought to the verge of extinction, she alone has survived? There is evidently here the contravention of a known law operating upon the organic history of the race. If there be a law generalized from a sufficient number of particulars, it is the law of successive vigor and decadence that has been impressed upon the empires and governments of the world. But upon this peculiar and distinctive society rests undimmed the *purpureum lumen juventatis*. She outlived the catastrophe which overwhelmed the antediluvian populations. She has stood at the entombment of Egypt, of Babylon, of Assyria, of Medo-Persia, of Greece, of pagan Rome, pronounced the funereal words, "Earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust," and has passed onward from their graves with an accelerated development and an undying life. This wonderful fact must challenge attention. The history of human empire has been a history of a rise and fall; that of the

church, of a rise and progress. The drama of human affairs ever returns upon itself and ends where it began—a tragedy which opens with life and closes with death; that of redemption ever unfolds some new and startling act, and advances to the consummation of a final judgment and a glorious heaven. The poem of humanity is a mournful elegy, its music a ceaseless dirge; that of the church a hope-inspiring epic, its music a grand march, blended, it is true, with minor strains, but passionately moving on to the hallelujah-chorus of a people redeemed and glorified, the coronation-anthem of a King triumphant and eternal. The progress of this world's societies is a procession to the grave; that of the church a jubilant movement to the gates of glory and the joys of immortality. Stand, then, the hopes of the church founded on God's unchanging Word! Yonder heavenly fires, the stars which lit the plains on which the patriarchs tended their flocks; the sun, which has risen and set upon the fluctuating dynasties of the past,—all shall pale into darkness, but the light of God's Word that burns in the church endureth forever. The prophetic aurora of an endless day, it shall suffer no disastrous eclipse, but is destined to cheer the gloom of the grave, to flush the sky of the resurrection morning, to gild the blackness which shall enwrap the cinders of the world, to blaze upon the judgment throne, and to illuminate with its unfading splendors the heavenly and immovable kingdom of Christ.

Here then we encounter a law of life pervading the church as a human society, which contradicts the law of decay and death enthroned amidst the ruins of other human organizations. Of what is this the effect, but of the immediate efficiency of God acting above and contrary to the natural laws which operate upon the systems of this earth? In other words, we are confronted by an amazing miracle.

2. The second department of the evidences in favor of a supernatural revelation is the internal—that derived from the contents of the Scriptures themselves.

(1.) The organic unity of the Scriptures is miraculous. That sixty-six books composed, many of them at least, at widely distant intervals, by authors who, from the nature of the case, could not

have had any concerted action, should be possessed and dominated by one great, central idea running through them all and reducing them to fundamental unity; that this leading and potential idea, dimly enounced at first, should have been developed more and more clearly and fully as centuries elapsed, developed not by the logical concatenation of a system, but by compositions of every variety, by histories, chronicles, codes of law, poems, psalms, lyric odes, proverbs, prophecies, epistles and didactic treatises, and developed by authors, some of whom were shepherds and fishermen; that the writers, so circumstanced, should have maintained a consistency with each other, excluding contradictions or even serious differences during the prodigious period of nearly sixteen hundred years,—this may safely be pronounced an impossibility, on the supposition that the result was to be accomplished in obedience to the known laws which operate upon the human mind. Such a case has never occurred in the history of merely human authorship, and nothing is risked by the assertion that it never could occur. There is no analogue to this organic unity of the sacred writings in all the annals of literature. An attempt was made by thinkers of the highest genius to develop the principles of the Kantian philosophy, but, scientific as were their discussions, it took only a few years to demonstrate that the effort to preserve unity was a disastrous failure. It literally, with the last of that splendid succession of speculative intellects, ended in *nothing*. It is seldom, as every student knows, that an individual writer of any voluminousness succeeds in avoiding self-contradiction. It is rare that two witnesses exactly agree in their testimony to an event which fell under their own observation. But that numerous writers, living through the course of a millennium and a half, should not only maintain harmony with each other in regard to a regulative principle, but despite a great variety in the minor and incidental topics handled by them, this is a fact that not merely transcends but contravenes the laws by which the imperfect faculties of men are controlled.

(2.) Much of the matter contained in the Scriptures is miraculous, not only as overpassing the power of human reason, but as contradicting the law by which it is limited.

This has already been proved with reference to the prophetic

contents of the Bible, and it need not be insisted on in this place. But there are truths in the form of facts and doctrines didactically delivered, in regard to which this holds good. In order that misapprehension may be avoided, let it be observed that the Scriptures and the gospel are not coincident as to the scope of their matter. All that is evangelical is scriptural, but all that is scriptural is not, at least primarily, evangelical. Redemption, for example, is evangelical and scriptural, creation scriptural but not evangelical. There would have been a great body of religious truth had the Scriptures never been communicated as a written revelation. But the Bible having been furnished to man as the supernatural and the latest revelation made by God, it incorporates into itself both the old truths of natural religion and the new truths of redemptive religion or the gospel. It is in this wide and comprehensive sense that the Scriptures are regarded in this discussion.

Now, with reference to the question before us, all the truths of Scripture may be distributed into three classes:

The first consists of those which, although they may be incomprehensible by the thinking faculty empirically proceeding by the discursive process, are enforced by the fundamental laws of belief which are elicited by experience into positive faith-judgments. Into this category fall such truths as the existence of God, creation from nothing, and the immortality of the soul. They are not strictly speaking supernatural, since the natural powers of the human constitution were designed to conduct to them. The revelation of them as natural, though supernaturally re-published by the Scriptures, cannot be said to contradict the law of limitation upon the human intelligence, for although reason, as thinking, cannot comprehend them, yet, as believing, it positively affirms them.

The second class comprises those truths which reason, in no aspect of it, either as thinking or believing or both, could have reached, but which, when made known by a supernatural revelation, that is one over and beyond the competency of the natural powers of man, fall in with the measures of reason, and are accepted and vindicated in conformity with its principles. Such, for instance, are the doctrines of a federal economy, implicating in itself the covenant of works and the representative relation of the

first man to his posterity, and also of the scheme of redemption, proceeding by the covenant of grace, mediation, vicarious atonement and the recovering grace of the Holy Ghost. These, as free determinations of the divine will, could never have been suggested by reason, but when communicated are not simply received by it upon arbitrary authority but as appealing for approval to its own principles. This class of truths, however, unlike the first, manifestly contradicts the law of limitation operating upon the rational powers. That law would, apart from supernatural revelation, forever have precluded the attainment of that kind of truth.

The third class embraces those truths which, when supernaturally revealed, are, in certain aspects of them at least, unsusceptible of confirmation by reason, but are accepted upon the naked testimony, the unsupported authority, of God. Such, for example, are the trinity, the incarnation of the Son of God, the constitution of his mediatorial person, and the resurrection of the dead. These doctrines are in no measure received on account of the evidence they themselves present to thought or even to faith. In themselves considered, they are both inconceivable and indemonstrable; but they are believed to be true simply because God so declares by an objective, authoritative, verbal revelation. Without doubt, therefore, they contravene the known law of limitation upon the human faculties, and as they are a part of the contents of the Bible, they constitute miraculous proof, in the highest degree, of its supernatural and divine origin. The fact that the trinity is dimly hinted at in some Oriental religions, and perhaps in the Platonic philosophy, only shows that these mutilated semblances of that doctrine were either remnants of the primitive revelation coming down by tradition through the ages, or derived from contact with the Hebrew people or writings.

But it may be said that these doctrines are mere vagaries of the imagination, or the crochets of wild speculation. Now, either they were produced by man, or they were communicated by the devil, or they were revealed by God. The supposition of the agency of holy spirits is unnecessary, as that could only have reflected the will of God. They could not have been produced by man, for he recognizes his own products—everything knows its own progeny;

but these doctrines, aside from an influence not native to him, he will not recognize, but, on the contrary, wholly repudiates. Further, what man produces man is able to understand. Although water cannot rise higher than its level, it can rise up to that level. But so far from understanding these doctrines, the natural man pronounces them contradictory to reason, inconceivable, incredible and absurd. They certainly are not man's products. They could not have been communicated by the devil, for they constitute parts of a system intended to deliver man from his dominion and to restore him to holiness and happiness. The argument of our Lord is here irresistible: A house divided against itself falls, and if Satan cast out Satan, by whom shall his kingdom stand? The only remaining supposition is, that they were revealed by God. And to this conclusion we are shut up by the requirements of this species of argument. The transcendent nature of these truths infers a transcendent origin. God alone could have been their author. The beams of morning light could have an origin no less glorious than the sun itself.

(3.) The conception of holiness, given in the Scriptures, is an instance of the contra-natural miracle. By holiness we mean the perfection of all moral excellence in God, and godliness, contradistinguished to mere civil virtue, godliness as the radical principle of all moral excellence in man.

Examine by the most rigid induction the religions of the race, apart from Christianity, and you will discover this conception of holiness absolutely nowhere. The absence of it is the generalization—the law, which you will reach. The Greeks and Romans represented their deities as guilty of crimes which, had their perpetrators been men, would have been punishable by human law. Was the king of Olympus characterized by holiness? Holiness? Their supreme divinity was an apotheosis of lust.

As to the conception of human holiness, it is nowhere found as having its root in supreme love to God. The universal law of sin seems to have rendered such a conception impossible. Take the human character of Jesus as portrayed in the gospels—a concrete exemplification of his own inimitable summary of a supreme moral law: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and

with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength; and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself;"—a miniature copy in humanity of the infinite perfections of God, as a small lake reflects a celestial hemisphere blazing with the glories of starry systems; and it is absolutely without a parallel, without a distantly approximative analogy in the length and breadth, the height and depth of human literature. The conception of such holiness was impossible to the sinful imagination of merely human genius.

We are complacently informed that some of the Oriental religions contain choice collections of the noblest moral precepts, that Christianity is not exceptional, but merely coördinate with other moral systems, and that consequently only an eclecticism which would assemble into unity the best features of them all would be entitled to the illustrious position of a universal religion. Suffice it now to say, that Christianity is the only religion which takes account of the revolutionary and disastrous influence of sin, and the only religion which indicates the means by which man may be recovered from its effects and elevated to holiness and therefore to happiness. It is the only scheme of redemption *from* sin and *to* holiness. This is its genius, this its professed end; and this it is which lifts it infinitely above the rabble of religions by which the world is fooled. Like the God whose holiness it represents, it knows no peer and tolerates no rival.

We are justified in concluding, then, that it is a law of universal scope that the religions of the earth make no provision for holiness, and as the Bible alone proclaims and promotes it, the Bible contravenes that law, and thus presents internal evidence of its divine origin which is contra-naturally miraculous.

3. The third and last general branch of the evidences in favor of a supernatural revelation is the experimental—that derived from the experience of its power.

The conversion and renovated life of individuals affords a proof of Christianity as supernatural, since it professes to secure these results, and the proof is miraculous, because these changes contravene the known law of sin. There is not time now, nor is there any need, to elaborate the proposition that sin operates upon

men universally, and operates with the force of an all-conditioning law. He who would maintain opposite ground would simply rave. The history of the race, the facts of observation as wide as the world, the testimony of individual consciousness, and the express statements of the Bible considered merely as a credible witness, all concur in establishing the universal law of sin. This law is contradicted and counter-worked in the experience of every converted man. His intellectual perceptions, his principles and motives, his feelings, tastes and will, from having been determined towards sin, are directed, at least dominantly directed, towards God, holiness and heaven. Were one professing to be a messenger from God, charged with a revelation supplementary to, and expository of, the Scriptures, which would reconcile the conflicting denominations of Christendom, to stand on the levee at New Orleans and bid the mighty Mississippi roll back to St. Louis more than half of its swirling current, and were the command to be obeyed, would we not confess a miracle contradicting the known laws of nature, and sufficient to constrain our conviction of a heavenly commission? It is a similar miracle when the main current of a sinner's thoughts, affections and volitions, which had been sweeping downward to hell, is turned back, and against the gravitation of nature rolls upward to heaven.

This kind of miracle is furnished to the individual to convince him, beyond doubt, of the divine origin of the christian religion and the sure foundation of his hopes. Other miracles are chiefly suited to affect the mass of outside inquirers. This influences principally the individual believer. Hence the illiterate disciple of Christ who cannot cope with the philosophic or scientific infidel on the field of argument, and who may, indeed, be but poorly acquainted with the external evidences of Christianity, is prepared, by an appeal to the miraculous results attested by his own consciousness, steadfastly to hold his ground and to withstand all assaults upon his faith. He can say, in reply to the sophistry of scepticism and in the teeth of its jeers: "One thing I know: whereas I was blind, now I see." This sure testimony to the miraculous change wrought in him, which is borne by his consciousness, renders him impregnable. His own converted soul is a

miracle—a monument inscribed by God's finger with the characters of supernatural grace.

But although conversion is a miraculous proof of Christianity designed chiefly to confirm the faith of the individual who experiences it, it is also suited to exercise an evidential force upon others than himself. His testimony to the fact of his conversion, as a spiritual and moral change revolutionizing his character, has to be accounted for upon the principle of cause and effect. There are tests by which the competency and credibility of a witness can be determined; and when a competent and credible witness testifies to convictions in his mind which he assigns to a certain cause, his testimony is worthy of credit unless another cause can be discovered which was adequate to produce those convictions. Is not this the underlying principle of testimony? It is true that the individual may be honestly self-deceived, and therefore it may be granted that the proof afforded to others by his testimony rises no higher than to a presumption.

If, however, in addition to his testimony to an inward, conscious change, a phenomenal and undoubted alteration takes place in his life and continues to its end, the previous presumption amounts to positive proof. "The tree is known by its fruits." The blasphemer becomes reverent, the drunkard sober, the debauchee chaste, the liar true, the thief honest, the churl charitable, the miser liberal, the murderer gentle, and the despiser of God and his ordinances a devout suppliant at the throne of grace in the closet, the family and the house of the Lord. Finally this renovated life terminates on a bed of death, not marked by insensibility to the impending crisis or the composure of mere submission to an inevitable stroke, but illuminated by unbroken peace or triumphant joy. The sun of life sets in a blaze of glory; the visage of the king of terrors is transformed into the face of an angel, and the gloomy gorge of death is lighted up as the resplendent passage to a beautiful and immortal home. To say that all this is the cheatery of fanaticism, or the infatuation of self-delusion, is what human nature will not endure. The logic of indisputable evidence and the pathos of profoundest feeling combine to resist the unreasonable and savage indictment.

The proof is mightily enhanced by the fact that the testimony of the individual is concurred in and corroborated by multitudes of individuals. "In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established": much more in the mouth of an innumerable throng. Many congregations in a single city, many in a single rural neighborhood, confirm the testimony. A vast host of congregations throughout a whole country swells the accumulating volume of evidence. From land to land the testimony rolls until, like the voice of nature, it resounds throughout the world. The whole contemporary church of true believers, wherever the sun in its circuit around the globe shines upon its sanctuaries, unanimously renders the same attestation. Can the infidel, in accordance with the laws of evidence, treat such a mass of concurrent testimony with contempt? Can he silence it with a sneer?

Add to this immense aggregate of contemporaneous testimony that of an uninterrupted succession of witnesses in every past age of the world's history, a column which began its march from the spot that was crimsoned with the blood of Abel, the first martyr of the Old Testament church, and has continued it—tramp! tramp! tramp!—through the centuries of the Patriarchal, the Jewish and the Christian Dispensations, and the case becomes simply overwhelming. Imagine now the sceptic, with curled lip, saying to this countless multitude of witnesses, You are all wrong, I am right. Picture him trying to still the thunder of this consentient testimony with a—pooh!

The argument which has now been urged, if based in truth, furnishes a refutation of the trite objection to miracles, that as alleged past facts they need to be proved as much as the religion they are adduced to prove, that having no parallel in our own experience, no testimony is competent to establish them. The objection is without foundation, if miracles are allowed—as they ought to be—the scope attributed to them in this discussion. Leaving out of account what we have denominated miracles of external fact, the continuance of which is a matter of dispute, the miracles involved in the fulfilment of prophecy, the propagation of Christianity, the supernatural contents of the Bible, and the ex-

perience of converted souls, are in a *continuous* process of exhibition before the eyes of every generation of men. They are not merely past facts depending upon testimony for their acknowledgment. They are also present facts subject to the proofs of observation and consciousness. Even if the followers of Hume and Strauss, in their attempts to storm the defences of Christianity, could succeed—and they cannot—in carrying the position of the sensible miracles, they would be exposed to a converging and ruinous fire from every other position along the line.

We have thus endeavored to show that all the evidences in favor of a divine, supernatural revelation are, as to their main features, characterized by a common element upon which they may be reduced to unity: they are miraculous, in the sense of contravening certain laws of that natural constitution, physical and mental, with which we are acquainted. As this can be done only by the immediate efficiency of God, extraordinary proof is supplied of his extraordinary interposition.

We close with the remark, that if evidence be not a delusion and argument not a juggle with words, Christianity is proved to be true; and if true, it is everlastingly, gloriously and, as Leslie has said, “tremendously true.” If, on the contrary, there are no principles grounding the certitude of human conviction, and evidence is a name and a sham, it must be granted that Christianity cannot be proved true; but then it would also follow that nothing can be proved true. Knowledge would be Nescience, philosophy Nihilism, and everything Nothing.

JOHN L. GIRARDEAU.

III. A SHORT METHOD WITH THE ANTITHEISTIC SCIENTISTS.*

SOME persons are of the opinion that the church will best serve the ends for which she has been instituted by simply proclaiming the truths of the gospel and taking no notice whatever of the speculations of a "vain philosophy," or of "science falsely so called." This, it is claimed, was the principle on which the great apostle of the Gentiles proceeded. While the Jews required a sign and the Greeks sought after wisdom, he yielded to the demands of neither, but preached Christ crucified, though he knew that his theme was a stumbling-block to the one and foolishness to the other.

Much may be said in favor of this view, for it is a revealed principle of the Economy of Grace that the vessels of mercy are not chosen—at least not largely chosen—from among the wise and prudent, and it is unquestionably true that those who are chosen are not called by dissertations on science or philosophy. There can be no reasonable doubt that, so far as the great mass of mankind are concerned, this is the principle on which the church should proceed; and it is a historical fact that it has been by those who have acted upon it that her greatest triumphs in the extension of Christ's kingdom have been won. In the present day, however, there are large numbers, not only of the cultured, but also of the artisan and general working classes, whose minds have been biased, not only against the gospel, but against theism in any form, whom it is the duty of the church, if she would prove faithful to her high commission, to endeavor to win from their attitude of antagonism by pointing out the utter groundlessness of the objections and arguments to which they have lent a too unquestioning ear. Discussions of this kind cannot, it is true, convert the souls of men, but they may serve to remove prejudices which pre-

* A speech delivered before the Fourth General Council of the Alliance of the Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian System, in Exeter Hall, London, July 5th, 1888, and contributed by the author to the PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

vent large classes of men from taking the claims of the gospel into consideration at all.

But it is said that the theologian as such has nothing to do with science or philosophy, and that the scientist or philosopher as such has nothing to do with theology. On this view of the relation of these classes to one another it may be remarked :

1. That it is most unscientific. The scientist cannot, on scientific principles, submit to the limitations prescribed. He cannot complete his investigations without transgressing the boundary so arbitrarily marked out. The reason is obvious. He is tracing phenomena to their causes, and the footprints he is following up are as clearly impressed on the other side of the boundary as they are within the confines already explored. These footprints all point outward, and, once embarked in the pursuit, the scientific Nimrod will brook no barrier until he has traced them to an adequate cause.

We have a remarkable illustration of the telic significance of the facts with which science has to deal in the history of Humboldt's *Kosmos*. He had not, at the outset, intended to write a *kosmos*. He had simply proposed to himself the preparation of a physical geography. His work was to be absolutely and exclusively terrestrial. But when he began to collect materials for it, he found that the facts selected were so closely related to other facts that they could not be treated in isolation from them. In fact, he found, what even the materialists confess they have found in their atomic ultimates, that "nothing exists out of relation." He found that the phenomena with which he had to deal were really parts of a *kosmos*—of one stupendous, harmonious whole.

It is questionable whether Humboldt rose to the full height of the argument furnished by these correlations. His conclusion is, that the universe, rationally considered, is a unity in diversity of phenomena, one whole (*τὸ πᾶν*) animated by the breath of life. He seems, like Strauss, to find the cause of the *kosmos* in the *kosmos* itself. In such conclusion, however, the truly scientific mind cannot possibly rest. The character of the contents of the *kosmos* forbids it. The mutual multitudinous inner relations of these contents demand a cause, and as they are so related as to consti-

tute one harmonious whole, the cause accounting for this wondrous harmony must be one cause, capable of ordering and marshalling the myriad hosts of this marvellous array.

Now, what is true of Humboldt and his labors in the construction of his Kosmos, is true of every worker in the fields of science. No matter how limited the field in which he elects to work, he finds notes of relations *ad extra*, which, if scientifically examined, must lead him, as they led Humboldt, into wider fields with similar hints of kindred fields beyond; and thus attracted further, from field to field of what is admitted to be a kosmos, he must, if he will but act in harmony with a fundamental principle of all science and philosophy, rise to the high scientific conception of an ultimate intelligence, the Author of all.

2. But besides being unphilosophic and unscientific, this limitation of the spheres of science and theology is manifestly unscriptural. The Scriptures invite to the study of God's works; and what is science but the systematic study of the works of God? If the heavens declare the glory of God, the declaration is made for our instruction, and demands our attention and earnest study. It was not for the contemplation of the things that are made that the apostle condemned the Gentiles, but for not perceiving in them evidence of the eternal power and Godhead of their Author. And if the men of Paul's day, who were destitute of any thing that could be regarded as an instrument of scientific investigation, were inexcusable for tarrying in the outer court of "the things that do appear," surely the men of our day, who possess such means for entering within the veil, and yet decline to approach and gaze upon the symbols of the divine presence, are left without apology or excuse.

Taking her stand, then, upon this philosophic, scientific, scriptural ground, the church has no reason to fear to meet her enemies in the gate. She can encourage the foremost of them in their investigations of the *arcana* of nature, and glory in the disclosures they make of the wonders of creation. When she has done this, she can meet them on the questions raised by their discoveries, and prove that, in every instance of an antitheistic inference, they have been guilty of violating the fundamental principle of all

science and philosophy, the principle of Causality. This may be regarded by some as a very bold assertion, but it is not recklessly made. It may be affirmed beyond successful challenge, that the antitheistic science and philosophy of our age are based upon a false conception of Causation. It is only through a mistaken notion of the true nature of a cause and of its relation to its effects, that any intelligent being can rest in any of the antitheistic *isms* of our day. The human mind instinctively seeks the unification of its knowledge through an ultimate cause that will account for the phenomena under consideration. This is a great psychological fact, and it is fatal to all the false science and philosophy that would ostracize God from his own universe.

MATERIALISM cannot stand this test. Its ultimate is not a unit, and cannot unify the knowledge of its worshippers. Sixty-odd simple elements can furnish an ultimate cause to no rational mind. The mutual affinities and antipathies of these elements, and their unity, despite their diversity, demand a cause, and forbid their exaltation to the throne of an imperial ultimate.

IDEALISM is equally at fault. He who has analyzed the contents of his own consciousness cannot rest in such pretensions intellectual illusion, which would make a god of the human Ego. The reason is obvious: he finds, very prominent among those contents, phenomena which, without doing violence to a law of his own being, he cannot avoid referring to a cause outside himself, having an objective existence independent of his cogitations.

EVOLUTIONISM, whether theistic or naturalistic, is also discredited by this principle. In either case the process is carried forward through the intermediation of second causes, and, therefore, at every step appeal is made to our intelligence to judge of it by the law which governs such causal relations. This great fact removes the whole question out of the region of the abstract and relegates it to the category of the concrete. We are not, therefore, under the necessity of speculating, as some theistic evolutionists wish us to do, in regard to what method the Creator might have adopted in the production of the several species of earth's *fauna* and *flora*. The question is not whether he might not have proceeded on the evolutionary principle, evolving the higher from lower organic

forms. This, it is conceded, he might have done, and this, it must be conceded, he may not have done. The sole question is, "What is the method revealed in the concrete instances presented in nature?" Are the links of the evolutionary chain causally linked together in unbroken parental and filial relation, or does each section in the ascending series give evidence of an independent, distinct specific genesis? The only answer warranted by the facts is that the Record of the Rocks knows nothing of the evolution of a higher from a lower organic form. Neither the paleozoic ages nor the living organisms of our world reveal an authentic instance of such evolution. Both nature and revelation proclaim it as an inviolable law, that like produces like.

ATHEISM offers no resting-place for a rational mind, for the ultimate cause to which it refers all phenomena is not possessed of the one preëminently essential attribute to which these phenomena point. It may be that under the spell and fascination of a theory a man may, for the moment, believe that the phenomena of this universe are but "the coördinate series of nature's great progression from the inorganic to the organic, from the formless to the formed, from blind force to conscious intellect and will," but such mental hallucination cannot be habitual. His scientific and moral instincts must often break in upon and scatter to the winds such unphilosophic musings and assert, in spite of such unhallowed bias, the claims of an ultimate Supreme Intelligence.

AGNOSTICISM can, least of all, abide this test. The ultimate to which it refers all phenomena is substance—substance disrobed of all attributes, the Kantian *Ding an sich*, the thing in itself, of which it is affirmed nothing can be known, as it is inscrutable. It does not follow from the inscrutableness of a thing that it is unknowable. We may not be able to scrutinize a thing and yet we may, otherwise than by our scrutiny, obtain knowledge of it. It may manifest itself to us and thus make itself known independently of our investigation. But the question arises, "How have the agnostics found out that any such entity as this *Ding an sich* exists?" As it is pronounced destitute of attributes, it possesses nothing by means of which it can address itself to our senses. It cannot be touched, tasted, seen, or smelt, or heard. Destitute of

attributes, it cannot make its existence known. No marvel that they allege it is both inscrutable and unknowable, but the marvel of marvels is, that while it can neither be scrutinized nor known, they still claim to know that it exists, and not only this, but claim to know that it is the ultimate cause of all things, the ultimate of ultimates! Such scientific legerdemain reminds one of the Irish entomologist who defined a certain insect as a little dark-colored creature which, when you put your finger upon it, was not there.

To all such pretensions, fallacious philosophy or science, we oppose the scientific, philosophical principle of Causality. There exists nothing in the universe destitute of attributes, and if such entity did exist it could be the cause of nothing. Attributes are essential to causal efficiency, and that which is the cause of all things must be transcendently glorious in attributes, and, in the production of all things, must have made these attributes so manifest that Agnosticism may well blush in presence of their manifested glory.

This same principle is fatal to POSITIVISM as a system of religion for humanity. Positivism finds its ultimate in the human race. To the race all the individuals of the species are subordinate and correlative, and their chief end is to love it, and live for the promotion of its well-being. This theory of human life, with its aims and ends, depends for its justification upon the assumption that the ultimate cause of the human race is the human race itself. Apart from this assumption it cannot have being in human thought, and, traced back to it, the theory becomes simply preposterous. No being save an uncaused, self-existent being can be an end to itself. As the human race began to be, its allegiance and devotion cannot be due to itself as if it were its own ultimate, but to the Cause that gave it being. Surely the Power that gifted it with being and endowed it with all those qualities which conspire to establish and maintain its well-being ought to be the object of its warmest love and profoundest reverence. It is true that this relation of the race to an intelligent source outside itself is not acknowledged by Positivism, but this refusal to confess an external source of the phenomena presented in the race

of man is all one with denying that a palpable, patent effect demands an adequate cause.

Equally unscientific is PANTHEISM, which seeks its ultimate in a dreamy back-ground, the source whence all phenomena in ceaseless flow come forth, and into which they all return. This ultimate "sleeps in the plant, dreams in the animal, and awakes to consciousness in man!" In a word, Pantheism asks us to believe, notwithstanding the marks of intelligence revealed both in the inorganic and organic worlds, that there was no conscious intelligence in either until the entire kosmos was arranged with all its marvellous harmonies and glories, culminating in the production of the human race! This is simply saying that intelligence never put in an appearance upon the theatre of action until a work involving the exercise of an Intelligence transcending all finite intelligence was completed. It is only by ignoring at every step and stage of this alleged evolutionary process the scientific principle of adequate Causality that any intelligent being can rest in this monstrous pantheistic ultimate.

In a word, as the principle of Causality is a constitutional principle of the human mind, all that is necessary in dealing with the antitheistic philosophy and science of our age is to make patent their violation of this primary belief. In its presence they must be as unhappy and helpless as Dagon was when he was shut in with the Ark of God.

ROBERT WATTS.

Assembly's College, Belfast.

IV. WAS CHRIST LIABLE TO SIN ?

It is not a little strange that an affirmative answer should be given to this question, especially by a Calvinist. While the literature of the controversy touching the impeccability of Christ is exceedingly scanty, owing to (*a*) the thorny nature of the matter to be investigated and (*b*) a general acquiescence in the orthodox doctrine, yet the following may be accepted as substantially the correct genesis of the question and its history: Those who adopted what may be called the Arminian philosophy of the basis and nature of moral responsibility, and consequently the Arminian theology of redemption—*i. e.*, those who maintain that the power of contrary choice is essential to moral responsibility—were confronted by those of the opposite philosophy and theology with these facts: 1. The power of contrary choice in electing virtue or vice, and thereby originating naturally irreversible conditions of subsequent existence, was limited to (*a*) the angels during the time from their creation to the fall of some and the confirmation of the rest, and (*b*) Adam and Eve from their creation to their fall. 2. That outside of these limits, so far as man knows, such does not and never did exist. (*a*,) Not in fallen man on earth, for he is led captive by Satan at his will; (*b*,) not in lost souls, for they are abandoned to the dominion of their own lusts; (*c*,) not in devils, for they cannot cease from sin; (*d*,) not absolutely in the regenerate, for they are graciously made indefectible; (*e*,) not in the glorified saints, for they are made impeccable; (*f*,) not in the holy angels, for they are confirmed in holiness; (*g*,) not in Christ, for *he was not liable to sin*; (*h*,) not in the Holy Ghost, whom it is blasphemy to charge with sin; (*i*,) not in the Father, for the same reason that it is not in the Holy Ghost. 3. That the scope of responsibility is not limited to the scope of one's own choice, because a creature is responsible for *being* evil as truly and fully as for *doing* evil, and his evil doing (fruit) is the result of evil being (evil tree). Yet the power of any choice, much less of contrary choice, is out of the question.

Each and all of these facts had to be assailed, and successfully,

by the Arminian, or his theory abandoned. Since the fall man has not been wont to abandon theories. Hence, the Herculean task of overcoming these facts has been attempted, some in one way, some in another. In respect of Christ, it has been boldly avowed that he was liable to sin (peccable). This avowal is made on three separate grounds: 1, From the nature of free-agency; 2, From the nature of temptation; 3, From the constitution of Christ's person. The reader will readily see that, strictly speaking, the controversy about Christ's impeccability is a subordinate part of the general one concerning the nature and basis of moral responsibility, and that we do justly in so treating it. But preliminary to the general discussion of the subject we must disencumber it of all matters not essential to it, and postulate some principles and facts necessary to a right apprehension of it. 1. God cannot be the author of sin; that is to say, sin cannot proceed from God; or, in other words, God cannot sin. This statement means that the Father, the Son, (ὁ λόγος,) and the Holy Ghost cannot sin; and by the Son we mean only the divine nature in Christ, as contradistinguished from his human nature. 2. It is granted that a mere creature, whether man or angel, under certain conditions, although holy, can sin, and that man and some angels, under these conditions, did sin. This admission implies that if Christ were a mere man he might or could have sinned if placed under these conditions. 3. Free-agency is expressly affirmed of all beings included in sections 1 and 2 above. This assertion carries with it the fact that they are all justly praise-worthy or blame-worthy, as the case may be. The general question, then, is this: *Is the power of contrary choice absolutely necessary or essential to moral agency or responsibility?* This question, as it relates to Christ, must be carefully eliminated from another. In affirming his liability to sin, it is customary to argue from the intense and immense sufferings of Gethsemane and Calvary, from which his human nature shrank. If liability to suffering necessarily implied the liability to sin, this plea would, or rather might, be valid; but it does not. We maintain with all our might that Christ was tempted, persecuted, despised, rejected, a man of sorrows, acquainted with grief, forsaken of God, cruci-

fied, and slain. He came into our room that he might be treated just as we deserved. But we must not suppose that the Father, in putting our guilt upon him, exposed him thereby to eternal ruin. His great struggle was not in trying to keep from sinning, but to bear the guilt of our sin. In the light of these remarks, we may justly limit the general question concerning the necessity of the power of contrary choice to moral responsibility, and restrict our inquiry to this: *Was the power of holiness such in Christ that it might have been overcome by the power of sin?* We are aware of an objection to our last statement of the question. A recent writer puts it thus: "Could not Christ have sinned if he had wanted to?" We answer, undoubtedly! But he who wants to sin is already a sinner. Who but a thief wants to steal? If any power on earth had caused him to want to sin, the work of his ruin would already have been accomplished. The physical power of utterance is one thing, the moral power to utter a falsehood another.

We wish here to emphasize more fully the difference between power to sin and power to suffer. There is here almost a total misapprehension of the nature of Christ's work on the part of some. He was manifested to destroy not the devil, but the works of the devil. His contest with Satan was only a part of his mission, an insignificant part comparatively. It was the burden of our sins, the penal sufferings voluntarily assumed on his part and fully inflicted on the part of the Father, that oppressed his soul, prostrated his body on the ground, and nailed him to the cross. Under the weight of these he said, "Now is my soul exceeding sorrowful, even unto death," and "sweat as it were great drops of blood," and cried, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" As compared with these, the temptations of Satan and the fancied attractions of sin sink into insignificance. Shall we, in view of Gethsemane and Calvary, in the presence of these grand, sublime, awful manifestations of the triune God, dare to say, or even think, that Christ assumed what might have been his ruin; that the Father put on him a burden that might have destroyed him; or that the Holy Ghost might have proved inadequate to sustain him while he, with yearning love to man and sublime de-

votion to God, was binding the victim on the altar and burning it in sacrifice to God? This was the cup that he prayed might pass from him. We are now ready to undertake the main argument.

I. We prove that Christ was impeccable FROM THE FACTS OF REDEMPTION. (a), It is incredible that God would undertake the general scheme of redemption, appoint a Mediator for the execution thereof, and put in the constitution of his person an element of weakness that might defeat his own purpose. All the actualities and possibilities of the future lay open before his eye, and provision against all possibility of defeat had to be made in the constitution and endowment of his person. This scheme proceeded on the assumption of a positive, certain, definite work to be done, presupposing equally definite qualifications in the person of the Mediator. He has never arrived at an adequate idea of the redemptive work who has failed to comprehend, not only that Christ was divine, but also that he had to be divine. The divine nature in Christ was not a gratuity, but a necessity, was not superfluous, but demanded. Hence the entire argument to be found in any treatise of systematic theology might be quoted here in our argument. But why had he to be divine? *To give infallible success to his work.* (b), This scheme of redemption from the Fall to Christ proceeded on the assumption of the certainty of its success. The prophets had foretold not only a general plan but a definite series of facts issuing in a definite result, and on God's side this foreknowledge was based upon his determination to effectuate his plan. Contingency in the sense of the interdependence of each effect on its own cause throughout the whole series is fully granted, but in the sense that Jesus might prove to be an inadequate cause is not granted, and this is just what we are maintaining. (c), The Scriptures expressly assert our view: "I have laid help on one that is mighty." He is called the "Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father." "Behold my servant WHOM I UPHOLD; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth: I have put my Spirit upon him: HE SHALL BRING FORTH JUDGMENT to the Gentiles. . . . HE SHALL NOT FAIL NOR BE DISCOURAGED. I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and WILL HOLD THINE HAND, AND WILL KEEP THEE." (d), Multitudes were already in heaven; their re-

maining there depended on the validity of their title, and this on the success of his work. To say that Christ could have fallen is to say that all the glorious achievements of grace might have been wrecked. But more; sin and Satan had exhausted their might on these saints with every circumstance in their favor. They had complete possession and control of the race of man. The strong man kept the house, until the stronger than he bound him and spoiled his house. This result was infallibly attained unto in every case, and is all of grace absolutely; yet the power that conquered in every instance was from the Saviour, was simply his power exerted upon them and for them. But the position we oppose is that the King had conquered in all cases for his subjects with every circumstance against him, yet could and might have failed for himself with every advantage in his favor. Add to this all conquests from the end of his humiliation to the end of time, without a failure or the possibility of failure. His people win in virtue of their mystical union to him, through which his power flows into them, while he won in virtue of the hypostatic union and plenary endowment of the Holy Ghost. If they win, all and always win, much more he. We must again remind the reader that the peril from which it is claimed he might have fallen is strictly from Satan, and that the method of Satan's conquests has always been through seduction. We must cast out of the account all that Christ did in the way of obeying and all he did in the way of suffering, viewed as set before him or enjoined upon him by his Father. The assault on him by Satan was made upon Satan's own prompting, and was not an essential part of Christ's mission. The idea that the Father set the devil on his Son is monstrous. He sent his Son on a mission, and Satan assaulted him while engaged in fulfilling his mission. Unquestionably the Father foreknew all this, and prepared his Son for the contest, thoroughly furnished him for it.

II. We prove, again, that Christ was impeccable (not liable to sin) FROM THE NATURE OF THE HYPOSTATIC UNION AND FROM HIS PLENARY SPIRITUAL ENDOWMENT. Our space is limited. We must ask the reader to get the Confession of Faith here and carefully study Sections I.-III., Chapter VIII.; Larger Catechism, Ques. 36-40.

The Confession says this union is inseparable, and the Catechism that the continuance of it is forever. This union being eternal and inseparable, the destiny of the person is carried by that of either nature in the person. Hence, without now calling up the purpose of the union, it is manifest the divine nature as involved in the issue of any effort Satan might make upon the human could not, so to speak, be a passive spectator to the ruin of the human by the seductions of Satan, but on independent grounds must put forth its power to the utmost, if need be, for self-preservation. Christ cannot be divided. The attack of Satan was made upon the historical, personal Christ. He came to fulfil a personal mission. The Bible knows no distinction of persons in him. If it had been possible, and he had fallen, it would have been the historical Jesus in his entirety that would have been lost. We do not feel called on to prove that he was God, or that God could not have sinned. He who denies his divinity, or affirms that as divine he might have sinned, is past reasoning with. The only possible way to meet us here is to deny the inseparability of the hypostatic union; and, as we know of no one in our age of the world who does this, we shall not offer any arguments in support of our view. But we here raise the question, What was God's design in constituting this union? We may see the answer more manifestly by asking, Did both natures coöperate or concur in the mediatorial work? There is but one answer. Take, for example, his atoning work, the one of all the most unlikely to call into exercise the divine nature, and we find such statements as this: "Feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." Here the humanity of Jesus, which alone has blood, is so united to deity that the blood is called and is the blood of God. The person was divine when he was crucified, and they crucified the Lord of glory. No one can read his history without seeing his divinity shining forth on every page. In all he said and did his Godhead was manifest; that is, in all his mediatorial work. His divinity was a necessity to give infinite value and eternal validity to his sacrifice, to impart infinite wisdom to the Mediator, to make his humanity infallibly certain to succeed, to conquer death, and reign over all things. We thus have two unfailing criteria to determine the

purpose of this union: *1st*, What it actually did, and, *2d*, What he could not have done without being divine—both of which show that both natures concurred and coöperated in his mediatorial work. The design of God was, then, in establishing the hypostatic union, to provide a Redeemer thoroughly furnished unto his work; one infinitely wise, good and powerful, in whose hands the work of God should and could not fail. In addition to this, the Saviour was endowed with the Holy Ghost without measure. It seems to us that God, foreknowing that man would be naturally prone to call into question the all-sufficiency of his Son, had exerted himself to make unbelief hereon if not impossible certainly extremely reprehensible; for, after making it legible on every page that all the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in him bodily, he expressly and repeatedly informs us of the Saviour's plenary endowment with the Holy Ghost. Armed with doubly divine powers in virtue of which the deep things of God were open to him and moral omnipotence at his command, the supposition that he still might have been overcome by Satan or sin becomes the supremest folly. The divine was incarnated in the human to make it triumph, and the Holy Spirit was given for the same purpose. If thus armed failure were still possible, with us it is inevitable.

Those whom we are opposing reply: "Notwithstanding all this, we are compelled to believe that Christ might have sinned, *1st*. Because the Bible teaches us that Jesus was tempted, and temptation implies the power to sin and the possibility of sinning; and, *2d*. Because, if he could not have sinned, he was not a free agent, and so not responsible, praiseworthy, or blameworthy." If we can remove these two objections, our task will be done. We propose to do more: to show our view to be the correct one out of the very facts mentioned. This brings us to the third point of our argument.

III. THE ISSUE OF THE TEMPTATION OF CHRIST DEMONSTRATES HIS IMPECCABILITY. Temptation does not imply the power to sin or liability to sin. God is said to have been tempted often. (Ex. xvii. 2; Num. xiv. 22; Ps. lxxviii. 18.) But God cannot sin. Temptation therefore does not prove that the party tempted may sin. If a reply is attempted by saying the word tempt has two mean-

ings—one to put to the test, the other to seduce—we grant it, and reply, if Christ were only put to the test as God was in the cases cited, our case is made out exactly, which is that a being may be tempted and yet incapable of yielding; and if any one should say he were tempted in the other sense, we simply point to that scripture which says, “YET WITHOUT SIN.” We might rest the argument here, but shall push it on to the end. There are two grounds for using the word tempt: (a), From the effect produced, and (b), from the purpose intended. As no effect was produced in Christ it is evident the word is used to express what Satan intended and tried to do. The word *πειρασθῆναι* often means exposure to suffering. Hence, “Christ *suffered* being tempted;” *i. e.*, put to the test by exposure to suffering, not by exposure to sinning, an idea foreign to the scope and derogatory to God. But more; that Christ knew who Satan was, and fully comprehended the falsehood and treachery of his assault, lies open upon the face of the narrative, and it cannot be allowed under any supposition that he would openly and knowingly renounce his allegiance to the Father and prostrate himself to Satan. His fall, if it had been possible, would have given him, instead of the kingdoms of this world and the glory of them, banishment from God, the penal agonies of spiritual and eternal death, and carried with him that spiritual body of which he was the head and fountain of life; and these facts were as open to his omniscient eye at the time as were the suggestions of Satan. He who denies this does in that act deny his divinity; and he who grants this does in that act grant that it was morally impossible for him to fall, which is the very notion of impeccability. Thus out of the rock upon which it is claimed our theory must split we extract the proof of its truth and vindication. We might, if space permitted, show from many notes in the narrative of the temptation that so far from seducing our Saviour as Satan sought, the effort was a supreme failure. Not one particle of evidence exists of faltering, or dallying, or hesitancy. His answers ring out promptly in every case in tones that cannot be misunderstood, disclosing his Deity at every step and in every word. His anointing for his work was not in vain. He was and is “God over all, and blessed forever.”

IV. Our fourth argument is FROM THE NATURE OF FREE-AGENCY. It is claimed that if Christ were exempt from the possibility of sinning, he would not in this respect be a free agent; and, hence, that his obedience and suffering were without moral significance or value. This point is really the Gibraltar of this theory, which, if broken down, carries with it the whole question. Notwithstanding the high claims made for it on the other side we have boldly made it our fourth argument to prove the very thing it is claimed to disprove. (a.) We grant and hold that when one makes a choice he must do so in some sense voluntarily and freely in order that he may be morally responsible. We designedly say "in some sense," for a man may choose under constraint and yet be responsible; *e. g.*, a christian in view of death may deny Christ, as Peter did. Force even unto death does not absolve from obligation. If it did, martyrdom would be suicide. The ground of responsibility is that an element of voluntariness is involved in the act of yielding to force, and some spontaneity is essential to responsibility. In doing what he does the party must yield consent. The fact and extent of violence have their place as modifying circumstances, but do not destroy responsibility. But when a man does or chooses anything with any degree of consent, spontaneity, or voluntariness, even the least degree, *he is both free and responsible*; and this *absolutely irrespective of any other question*. The question about the power of contrary choice is another thing *toto cælo*. Take an illustration. Mr. A. has used intoxicants until his power of resistance is gone, and he is an absolute slave to this craving for them. Mr. B. hands him the glass filled of "the best." Now, note two facts: (1,) He has no power of contrary choice; (2,) He drinks as freely, as voluntarily, as ever he did or could. His responsibility takes no account of the first fact, but fastens itself finally and eternally and in spite of all the powers that be upon the second fact. We know of no one who denies that Satan cannot choose holiness, the contrary of sin, and of no one who exonerates him from wickedness in the planning and the executing of his cruel and nefarious designs. (b.) Moral responsibility extends beyond the sphere of the personal choice of each individual. A man is as responsible for not being good as for not doing good. Good-doing is simply the

outward expression of good-being. "By their fruits ye shall know them." "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." (Matt. vii. 15-20; xii. 33; Luke vi. 43-45.) But that man does not live who has any choice about whether he shall or shall not be depraved; no mere man ever was born who had the choice of being born either depraved or holy. True, another, thousands of years ago, made the choice for him; but our question does not relate to imputed guilt, but to personal depravity: not to how he became depraved, but to the existence of moral defilement; and this is reprehensible wherever it is found. Here, then, we have moral responsibility absolutely without the opportunity of personal choice. The friends of the "peccable theory" must either deny that hereditary depravity is reprehensible, or affirm that each personal will voluntarily chose to be ushered into existence morally defiled, or admit that moral responsibility extends beyond the scope of our ability to choose. The principle here evolved is of wide application; is indeed at the foundation of all forms and kinds and degrees of representative government.

(c.) A man whose expression is not self-expression is incapable of praise or blame. Touching this idea Dr. Thornwell said: "It is inconsistent with accountability. As well might a weather-cock be held responsible for its lawless motions as a being whose arbitrary, uncontrollable will is his only law. What can the man account for? His actions have arisen from no moral considerations whatever; he acted because he acted; and this is the only account he can give." What we mean by self-expression is that the man's own inner moral character is manifested or expressed by his outer conduct. "As he thinketh so is he." The whole structure of government rests on the assumption that conduct is the reflex, the echo, the photograph, of which the man is the subject. Liability to fall is an infirmity; the removal of it is only the removal of an infirmity: yet thereby is the party rendered impeccable: that is to say, according to the hypothesis of the "peccables," by removing an infirmity we destroy moral agency and responsibility! The party may go on forever rejoicing and praising God, and blessing man, still he is entitled to no honor or reward! We declare that to treat such a being in such a manner would be a finished speci-

men of injustice. His conduct would be the expression of his holy and noble nature, freely and joyfully put forth, and yet because he is too godlike to sin, because of the very nobility of nature, forsooth he is not meritorious! (*d.*) This dogma really destroys responsibility throughout God's universe. We gave a detailed outline of this in the first part of this paper, and shall only detain the reader now to the study of one case of it. It is granted by all that the glorified saints are indefectible, *i. e.*, impeccable, for if they could sin they could fall, *i. e.*, would be defectible. But this dogma imposes upon us the necessity of denying either that they are indefectible or that they are free agents, and praiseworthy. It applies in the same way to Christ and to God. Since the fall of Adam the kind of free-agency demanded by it as the only kind has not existed, or if it has God has not made the fact known to us. Since the fall man naturally has never had any ability of will to anything spiritually good. He is dead in sin; is led captive by Satan at his will; but under the ruling of this theory we are shut up to the conclusion that in this condition man is not responsible. Says the Word of God, "No man *can come* unto me (*δύνεται . . . ἐλθεῖν*) except the Father which sent me draw him;" and then declares that this utter impotency is lodged right in the will: "Ye *will not come* unto me," etc., (*οὐ θέλετε ἐλθεῖν*). They *cannot* because they *will not*. Was ever language more pungent, pointed, definite, or scientific? Yet this hypothesis says, if they cannot they are not responsible! that is to say, as soon as one becomes so bad that he cannot be good, he ceases to be a moral agent and blameworthy! sin becomes its own cure! and Satan subverts his own kingdom!

We notice a general tendency to treat constraint in one respect for constraint in every respect, or inability in one point for it in another. He who acts in one respect as he wants to act is in that act a free agent, though he were not free in all other respects, and the same is true of his choosing. We must here meet a singular, popular catch-phrase which we have heard. It is intended to evade the force of our statement when we said sinners in their own strength cannot come to Christ, of which inability the reason is they will not, and the catch-phrase is, "They could if they

would." Such an expression would be tolerable if it came from a very ignorant and illiterate man, but is intolerable in any one else. When the impotency lies *in* the will, the phrase, "they could if they would," means precisely this, *they could if they could!* a most instructive piece of information. It is the identical principle taken inversely which we met before when we were told that Christ could have sinned if he would, or wanted to.

Another objection demands attention. It is this: if any other being than ourselves directly and immediately enables us to win in temptation or to be impeccable, we are not rewardable therefor, because that other being is the only meritorious party. The design of this point is to show that if deity in Christ made humanity impeccable, the free-agency of his humanity was superseded, and there was no merit in his work. The only point we are concerned with is this: God can make man triumph and render him indefectible without impairing, much less destroying, free-agency, and can do this without establishing a hypostatic union. We grant that such is the logical sequence of the "peccable theory," and one that should refute it; but we were not prepared to see it where we did see it. If the divine in Christ, in rendering him indefectible, superseded the human and destroyed his responsibility, the Holy Ghost or Christ, or both, in eradicating sin from us, in giving us the victory over sin and Satan, and in glorifying us, supersede our responsibility and destroy our merit. More than that; an impassable gulf is fixed, not only between creature and creature, but also between creature and Creator, or creature and Redeemer; and merit becomes so intensely personal that the slightest touch of external force, no matter how given, to that extent destroys responsibility; in other words, the supernatural in personal religion becomes impossible. In round numbers we may summarize the effect of this all-comprehending theory thus: the good and the bad may respectively grow better or worse; the former increase in merit, and the latter in demerit, provided their growth is not the effect of an external cause, until they arrive at that point where the one *cannot* sin and the other *cannot but* sin; and there they cease to be free agents, cease to be morally responsible, praiseworthy or blame-worthy. Thus we have traced this theory step

by step to its final culmination, without seeking to show its direct overthrow of our hope. It was deity incarnate that laid the foundation of all our hope, and it is deity in grace that begins, continues and ends our meetness for heaven. Religion without the supernatural in it everywhere, as life in the body, is but bald Deism. Religion with God in it everywhere is Christianity.

We are not yet done. The true idea of free-agency proves our view as well as disproves the other. What is free-agency? The word *agent* is ambiguous. It means one who acts, or simply an actor, and relates primarily to outward physical action. To illustrate: Mr. A. can lift five hundred pounds. Supposing no external interference he is a free agent in the matter of lifting any weight from zero to five hundred pounds. These two points are the limits of his agency. Beyond them he is not free; within them he is free. We thus learn that free-agency, in the physical world, has its limitations, and that they are generally very narrow. Mr. A. is an agent, because he does the lifting; is free, because he does it of his own accord. The limitations and narrowness do not destroy his freedom within this sphere. Intelligence has its *maximum* and *minimum*. Between these the mind expatiates and explores and knows, and is free; beyond them it cannot go. In the world of morals we still find freedom, and find it under conditions and limitations, beyond which it is as useless to talk of going as of Mr. A. lifting the earth, or of a finite mind comprehending God. Freedom within limited bounds is man's universal experience, and in no case do the limitations destroy his liberty within them. The physical world has its physical conditions, the mental world its mental conditions, and the moral world its moral conditions; and these each after its own kind. "Order is heaven's first law," because it is the product of law, and this immutable law imposes upon our being a structural form and modes of manifestation as inexorable as fate. We live and move and have our being within them, and by means of them put forth our spontaneity and manifest our liberty. Self-expression, whatever self be, or self-prompted expression, is liberty.

It is said that a ball placed exactly on the dead-line between the

earth and moon would, if undisturbed by any other cause, remain there forever; but, if removed the least from that line on either side, would move on, almost imperceptibly at first, until it would strike the body towards which it started. This movement would occur under the conditions and laws of the physical world, there being absolutely no external intervention. Immediately on passing from the dead-line it passes under a law that carries it right on to its destiny. So, on the one hand, a soul, upon passing into sin, immediately passes under a law of sin and death, and by this law is carried on to its destiny; and, on the other hand, a sinful soul, upon passing from under the law of sin and death by supernatural intervention, immediately passes under the law of grace and life, going onward conquering and to conquer forever. The soul sinking into death has its own determinate substance, form and laws of deterioration, under and according to which its spontaneity manifests itself in self-assertion and self-expression; and the soul rising into life has also its own substance, form and laws of melioration, under and according to which its spontaneity manifests itself in self-assertion and self-expression. Law reigns everywhere. Grace is supernatural and sovereign, but is not lawless. Order is heaven's first law, because order is the offspring of law. We have thus tried to fix the limits that bound man's freedom. Within them man is free, thinks, feels and acts as pleases himself. The kind and extent of his liberty are predetermined by his substance, structural form and the laws of his being. If he chooses, it must be under the laws of choosing; if he wills, under the laws of willing; if he feels, under the laws of feeling; if he thinks, under the laws of thinking; and if he acts, under the laws of acting; and in none of these beyond the measure of his ability.

V. Our view is that of the REFORMED THEOLOGY. "They whom God hath accepted in his Beloved, effectually called and sanctified by his Spirit, CAN NEITHER TOTALLY NOR FINALLY FALL AWAY FROM THE ESTATE OF GRACE." "This perseverance of the saints depends NOT UPON THEIR OWN FREE WILLS." "Man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so as a natural man, being altogether averse from good, and dead in sin, IS NOT ABLE, by his own strength, to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereto." "He is indis-

posed, disabled, and made opposite to all that is spiritually good, and wholly inclined to all evil, and that continually." The quotations will be recognized easily. God sovereignly and graciously causes the saints to persevere and to triumph, yet they are ennobled, exalted, and rendered praiseworthy thereby; and their own lusts, to which sinners are given up, hurry them on to crime, yet they are degraded and rendered blameworthy thereby. God can and does take humanity in its lowliest condition, and make it like himself, and carry it to his bosom in heaven, without superseding man's agency and responsibility; and something approximating the inverse of this is seen in demoniacal possessions.

The application of the general principle to the case of the Lord by theological writers is of rare occurrence, chiefly because it has rarely been denied. "*Indifferentia ad opposita in nullo agente libero sive creato sive increato deprehenditur; nec in Deo, qui liberrime quidem bonus est, non tamen indifferenter, quasi possit esse malus, sed necessario et immutabiliter; nec in Christo, qui liberrime Deo obedivit, et tamen maxime necessario, quia non potuit peccare; nec in angelis et beatis, qui summa cum lubentia Deum colunt, et ad bonum tamen necessario sunt determinati; nec in dæmonibus et reprobis, qui non possunt non peccare, quamvis libere peccent. Ita nec illorum constantia et immutabilitas in bono destruit eorum libertatem, sed perficit; nec istorum ineluctabilis pertinacia et obfirmatio in malo obstat quominus gravissime peccent, adeoque summo digni sint supplicio. Quid hic excipi potest? 1. An aliam esse rationem libertatis divinæ, aliam nostræ? R. Sed quo libertas Dei perfectior est nostra, eo remotior debet esse ab indifferentia, quæ non tam virtus est, quam defectus libertatis. 2. An Christum, licet nunquam peccaverit, non fuisse tamen absolute impeccabilem, nec repugnasse ejus naturæ, voluntati, aut muneri, peccare potuisse? Quam blasphemiam Episcopus et alii Remonstrantes eructare non erubuerunt. R. Sed absit a nobis, ut tale quid sanctissimo Dei Filio vel cogitemus vel dicamus, quem novimus fuisse ἄνακον, ἀμίαντον, separatum a peccatoribus, qui nullum commercium cum peccato non solum habuit, sed nec habere potuit.*" (Turretin, Loc. Dec., Q. III., secs. 5 and 6).*

* Indifference to opposites in no free agent, whether created or uncreated, is found; not in God, who is indeed most freely good, but not indifferently, as if he

In his work on "The Will," Part II., secs. 1-3, Edwards presents the same views with unanswerable arguments. As space forbids us to quote extracts, we can only commend this treatise to the reader. Dr. Wm. Smith, in his "History of the Bible," says: "It is impossible for us to form a complete conception of our Lord's temptation, since temptation with us is always associated with the possibility of sin, whereas Christ's trial was that of one who could not possibly have fallen." (Page 592.) "We may now ask, Could our Lord, in whom the Father was well pleased, possibly have possessed a sinful nature, since sin is pronounced to be that abominable thing which God hates? . . . So the Holy Jesus though himself man neither sinned nor was liable to sin." Again: "Vain, then, must it appear, from all that has been said, to evade the question respecting Christ's holiness of nature by substituting the word *peccable* for *sinful*, since it appears from the inseparable union between manhood and Godhead, it was alike impossible that he could either sin or be liable to sin." (Graham Mitchell (quondam) Whitburn, Scotland.) "Were we to say the grace of God is not invincible, we should be under the necessity of adopting the opinion, which we have already proved to be unscriptural, that there is in man a power to comply or not comply with the call of the gospel." "The great objection against the invincibility of grace is that it is subversive of the liberty of the will. It seems incredible to some that a man should be free, and at the same time should be infallibly

could be evil, but necessarily and immutably ; not in Christ, who most freely obeyed God, and yet most necessarily, because he could not sin ; not in the angels and beatific, who with supreme pleasure and delight worship God, and to good are necessarily determined ; not in demons and the reprobate, who are not able not to sin, although they sin freely. So that of the former the constancy and immutability in good do not destroy but perfect their liberty, and the unavoidable pertinacity and obduracy of the latter in evil do not hinder but that they sin grievously, and are thus worthy of supreme punishment. What here can be excepted ? 1, That the *rationale* of divine liberty is one thing, of ours another ? Reply : But in what the liberty of God is more perfect than ours in that it should be more remote from indifference, which is not so much a virtue of liberty as it is a defect. 2. That Christ, although he did not sin, was not therefore absolutely impeccable, and that it was not repugnant to his nature, office, or will to have been able to sin ? Which blasphemy Episcopius and other remonstrants do not blush to eructate. Reply : But be it far from us to say or to think such a thing of the most Holy Son of God, whom we have known to be sinless, undefiled, and separate from sinners, who not only had no commerce with sin, but could have none.

determined to a particular purpose." (John Dick.) Dr. A. A. Hodge says that the idea of transferring our inherent sinful nature to Christ "is nonsense on the one hand and *infamous blasphemy* on the other." (See *Atonement*, pp. 175-'6.) But if Christ might have sinned himself, why blasphemy? Evidently he held our view. Dr. Plumer held our view. Of living writers we mention Drs. Dabney, Peck, and Quarles*—a trio of whom the church is proud, and justly so. We subjoin an extract from a letter of Dr. Peck, which was not written for the public eye: "The literature of the subject of the impeccability of our Lord is, as you say, scanty. The reason is obvious enough. Our conclusions about it must be determined by our views of the nature of free-agency, the nature of temptation, and the constitution of Christ's person. If 'the power of contrary choice' be essential to free-agency, if temptation necessarily implies a liability to fall, if the Nestorian view of Christ's person be the true view, then the peccability is established. But, if those views are false, as all consistent Calvinists hold them to be, then the impeccability follows as a necessary inference. Accordingly we find that Pelagians and semi-Pelagians generally hold the first, and Calvinists the second. The 'Scotists' in the middle ages held the first: the Thomists the second, with some exceptions on both sides."

The theory of the peccability of Christ cannot be sustained except upon principles that, if true, would overturn the scriptural doctrine of man's native bondage to sin, our responsibility for being depraved, the regenerate's indefectibility, the security of the saints in heaven, the claim of praise to the unchangeably holy, the justice of God in punishing abandoned wickedness; it is also at variance with the fundamental conditions of free-agency, and the orthodox view of the constitution of Christ's person. It tears away divinity from the humanity of Christ while he hung on the cross, and gives us Hamlet's play with *Hamlet* left out. There is not a valuable tenet in the Calvinistic system that is not logically involved in this theory and subverted by it. *Non sine causa.*

C. W. HUMPHREYS.

* "I hold that the dogma of the peccability of Christ is not only untrue but of very evil tendency."—*J. A. Quarles.*

V. THE NON-SECULAR CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH.

THE recent agitation of certain questions in the church has compelled the more particular consideration of the non-secular character of the kingdom of Christ. The Confession of Faith distinctly prohibits the courts of the church from handling or concluding anything but that which is ecclesiastical, and from intermeddling with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth. All the bodies which accept this Confession stand pledged to this general principle, the purely spiritual character of the church. Yet the course of events in one or two of the leading organizations which accept the Westminster Standards has proved that *the construction* of the principle is so widely divergent as really to amount to a difference of principle itself. The Southern Presbyterian Church contends for a strict construction of the principle. The Northern Presbyterian Church contends for a construction of it, to say the very least, which creates a material difference of conviction with the Southern Church. The difference is so great it not only amounts to a difference of principle, but produces a widely divergent policy in practice. This has proved one of the serious obstacles to the movement towards a union of the churches. It is an offence to integrity as well as to good sense to assert an identity of principle, when the construction given to it warrants action on one side which the other seriously disapproves. Adhesion to the same form of words does not reveal identity of principle, when they are construed in wide variations of sense. The Northern Presbyterian Church has taken action which, in its own judgment, was entirely warranted by the Standards; while, in the judgment of the Southern Church, that action was in open violation of them. To vindicate either of these varying judgments, it has become important to understand more fully and intelligently than seems to be done on either side the real nature and scope of the spiritual character of the church. The principle seems to lie in a vague form in the mind of both parties; the distinctions in its application appear in large masses, indicating the difference in bulk rather than in outline, and now and then appa-

rently overlapping the supposed boundary between them. The consequence is more or less perplexity in many individual minds; a fear to impeach what is nevertheless vaguely apprehended as error; a timidity in asserting firmly what is nevertheless felt to be probable truth. Resistance or consent to organic union is thus more or less paralyzed, and matters are left to drift helplessly towards an undirected conclusion. It is the aim of this article to try and help forward a more definite conception of the spiritual or non-secular character of the church. The question is broad and full of difficulty, and the writer has no such presumptuous hope as that he can do more than lift a torch in the darkness. In attempting to find a way through the primeval forest he is entitled to a generous construction and to all the help which can be given him. Even his mistakes may promote the discovery of the truth, and he will welcome any fair exposure of any important error. If he fails altogether, he will have done what he could.

This is no new question springing up in the emergencies of the modern church. It animated the long conflict of the Gallican and Ultramontane parties in the Roman Catholic Church. It has been more or less involved in the disputes about the relations of the church to the state in more than one country in Europe. It was implicated in the Erastian struggles in Scotland. It still asserts itself in the theories of modern Romanism and in the progress of the Protestant Church. It assumes various forms; now involving the relations of the church to the civil government; now to secular societies of various kinds within the wide bounds of the civil sphere. In the study of a question so broad and complicated, if it should prove difficult to throw an unimpeachable light on many of its parts, we can only hope for an appreciation of the effort, if not an endorsement of its success.

1. Christ fixes the non-secular character of his kingdom in the declaration, "My kingdom is not of this world," which is negative in form, and in the maxim, "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's," which is positive in form. These words clearly imply, first, that there are *different spheres of duty* under bounds which are prohibitory of any trespass of any one of these spheres upon another;

and second, that there is a radical distinction between a secular and a spiritual kingdom. In reference to the first of these implied ideas, it is universally recognized in the grand generalizations of collective duties called the state, the family, and the church. Man is recognized not only as bound by the law of God under each of these categories, but as having his own highest interests involved in discharging the duties of each free from all control of the others. The state has no right to dictate how the duties of the sacred sphere of the church or the family are to be discharged, nor to accept dictation from either or both of them. To allow this interference of one is to allow it of all, and to allow it of all is to obliterate the healthful distinction between them altogether. Any duty clearly traceable to any one of these spheres is thereby excluded from the others, and it is tyranny for them to interfere with it. The state has no right to determine the uses of ecclesiastical power, nor the church to interfere in the domestic government of the family. To do it is tyranny and usurpation. All the great spheres of human duty are guarded from trespass by each other by the full force of the authority of the law which prescribes them, that is, the authority of God.

The second of the implied ideas in the maxim of our Lord is that there is a radical and unalterable distinction between a secular and a spiritual institute, between a kingdom of this world and a kingdom not of this world. The chief distinction is in these points: A secular kingdom is a corporate power ordained to secure life, property and personal rights in this world. Its whole *aim* is limited by the present life; hence its name, secular. It is wholly an affair of time. Its *scope* as well as its period is confined to matters of this life and under definite national bounds. Its *ends* as well as its scope of action are of this life; it aims to secure human well-being under the specific limits and denomination of civil and political interests. Its *means* are compulsory within its legitimate sphere. Those means are: First, the enactment of laws; second, provision for the judicial administration of them; third, for the execution of them—all of these legislative, judicial, and executive functions colored to their characteristic complexion by the underlying notion of *compulsory force*. A secular

kingdom rests upon force as its radical idea, and is lawfully empowered to appoint the officers and provide the physical power without which all its functions would be paralyzed. It may fill all this grand and all-important sphere, but cannot lawfully go beyond it or intrude within the boundaries of any coördinate sphere of collective duty.

A kingdom defined as spiritual in positive form is described by Christ in a negative form: it is not a kingdom of this world. It is just the opposite of such a kingdom as we have just described. Its *aims* are not confined to this world. Its *scope* is not bounded by any certain geographical lines. Its *ends* are not physical or temporal well-being under the limits of civil and political rights. Its means are *not compulsory* within its legitimate sphere. Its power to make laws, its power of judicial and executive administration, which do exist because it is a kingdom and not a sham, are nevertheless colored in no extent and to no degree by any underlying notion of compulsion in the hands of the kingdom. As a secular kingdom rests upon force as its radical idea, and is empowered to organize that force in the hands of officers lawfully appointed for the purpose, a spiritual kingdom *does not* rest upon force, and it is *not* empowered to provide coercive energy in the hands of men, either directly or indirectly. If it does, all its true functions are paralyzed. So much for the development of the character of a spiritual kingdom as contained in the negative definition of our Lord.

Let us now reverse the process of the analysis, and retracing along the same divinely suggested lines see what appears on the *positive* side of this spiritual character. As negatively its aims are not confined to this world, its aims are positively directed to another world. As negatively its scope of influence and exerted power is not limited to matters of this life, nor confined by definite national limits, its scope is positively extended over matters concerning the world to come, and reach beyond all national bounds, and embrace the whole world. As its ends are negatively defined as not the physical or temporal well-being of mankind, they are positively defined as the moral and spiritual well-being of the human race, the control of those elements of their nature which

relate their well-being to the conditions of that other world, which is the grand scope of a spiritual institute. As its power is negatively defined as not compulsory, it is positively defined as convincing and persuasive only. A spiritual kingdom may fill all this great sphere, but cannot lawfully go beyond it or intrude into the bounds of any coördinate but independent sphere. The general conclusion, then, is clear enough, that neither of these two species of kingdom, the temporal and the spiritual, can seek the ends or employ the means which have been assigned to the other.

Before we pursue the lines of inference from this distinction in the two spheres of power, there are two circumstances which require a brief notice to avoid complication, and prevent a too narrow application of the principle. The first refers to those "circumstances concerning the worship of God and government of the church common to human actions and societies," which are recognized in the Confession of Faith as equally necessary in both the temporal and spiritual spheres, essential to carrying out the legitimate granted power of both, and as such usable by each without the imputation of trespass upon the other. The other circumstance is that the distinction of the temporal sphere embraces not only civil government proper, but a variety of things belonging to the social, domestic and personal rights and interests of mankind, societies and combinations for various secular but valuable purposes within the shadow of the civil government, but not under its control, and equally under the shadow of the spiritual kingdom, but not under its control. So far as those "circumstances common to human actions and societies" are concerned, though they are secular in their nature, they are competently used in the discharge of ecclesiastical functions just because they are essential to the discharge of them, and this use of them implies no departure from the sphere of the church. The building of houses for public worship, the rules of business in the organization and working of ecclesiastical courts, though secular in themselves, are properly employed in the work of the church, and imply no violation of its spiritual character. In these things there are *independent common rights of action* between the temporal and the spiritual spheres, rights of usage in the same things which are assertable by each

without trespass upon the territory of the other. A *right in common* precludes the notion of usurpation or trespass, and is perfectly consistent with the obligatory general line of distinction in spheres. No such common right can be construed as obliterating this line of distinction, or as in any way justifying the imputation of a trespass by one on the sphere of the other. The principle which limits the church in the use of these secular things is *incidency* to its own business; that alone justifies it, and that alone fixes the limit upon the use of these things by the church. The church can engage in nothing secular, except it is incidental and necessary to the discharge of some of its own functions. This principle of limitation is far-reaching and effective. Discounting, then, this admitted lawful implication of the spiritual sphere in secular things, we are able to raise into a more compact form the question touching those interferences with secular affairs which imply a real departure in the church from its true bounds.

As this discrimination was necessary to prevent the issue from going too far and embracing too much, it is equally necessary to recognize the implication of other things besides civil government proper, in the temporal sphere, from which the church is equally precluded. This is necessary to prevent the question from growing too narrow. The multiplication of all sorts of secular organizations, societies for reform or charitable purposes, combinations for personal or social advantage, has become a marked feature of modern society. The relation of the church to these societies has been necessarily the result of their existence, and the question how far the church may lend its aid to them is a part of this broad question touching the spiritual character of the church. These associations lie clearly within the secular sphere, and that fact alone carries the determination of the proper relation of the church to them. We are now prepared to come closer to the question or questions properly involved in the inquiry.

2. As we have already seen, the kingdom of Christ is sharply distinguished from a kingdom of this world. They differ in aim, in period, in scope, and in means to carry out their ends. The antagonism is so complete that the assignment of anything to the one is its exclusion from the other. The only point in which this antago-

nism does not exert this exclusive force is in those rights in common necessary to the discharge of essential function by each. Neither can seek the ends or employ the means of the other. The detailed illustration of this principle will go far to explain the mutual relations of the two species of kingdom. Let us take up the sphere of the church and analyze it in order to develop these relations as far as needful.

3. The kingdom of Christ, though a spiritual, is nevertheless *a real kingdom*. It is designed to govern men; but the nature and purpose of its government, the scope, extent, and limitation of its governing powers, are clearly defined in its great charter. It is possessed of a certain species of legislative, executive and judicial powers, all of which are colored by the nature of the *power* which is characteristic of the government. There are two modes of governing mankind: one by compulsion, the other by persuasion. The instrument of the one is force; the instrument of the other is conviction. The means of the one is physical power; the means of the other is truth. The rightful employment of the one marks the sphere of a kingdom of this world; the rightful employment of the other marks the sphere of the kingdom of Christ. When Pilate inquired of Jesus whether he claimed to be a king, Jesus answered that he did. The suspicions of the Roman magistrate, which were probably roused by this avowal, were instantly allayed when Jesus added: "For this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth." Pilate was too dull to understand promptly how truth could be an instrument of rule or what truth could be rationally so employed. He could only vaguely inquire, "What is truth?" But he saw plainly that the claim of the Nazarene involved no interference whatever with the civil sphere and the supremacy of the Roman empire. He saw that a government by truth and a government by force involved no incompatible elements, and might readily co-exist without mutual disturbance. This radical idea, government by persuasion, controls the whole frame of a spiritual kingdom. As the legislative, judicial and executive functions of a kingdom of this world are colored by the underlying notion of compulsory force, so the legislative, judicial and executive func-

tions of a kingdom not of this world are colored by the underlying notion of the persuasive force which is peculiar to such an institute. *Truth* is the grand implement of persuasion, and is *therefore the only lawful weapon of a spiritual kingdom*.

4. Truth being the great and only lawful instrument of the christian kingdom, it follows that *teaching* is the great function of that kingdom. Her commission is defined in the words, "Go, teach all nations whatsoever I have commanded you." To ascertain the scope of this teaching function of the kingdom is to ascertain the true nature and work of the kingdom itself. The commission of the church defines the field of her instruction to be all the nations of the world. It defines her teaching officers as the first in importance of all her agents. It involves instruction, both in public and from house to house. It settles that all her public proclamations, her private lessons, her hortatory and persuasive appeals, must be based upon *instruction*; and just so far as her teachers seek to entertain or excite apart from clear unfolding of truth, they are defective in the discharge of the ministerial commission. It determines also the kind of truth which it is commissioned to teach. While truth is to be the sole instrument by which she is to govern, not any or all kinds of truth are committed to her charge, or made either obligatory or subject to her discretion. The limitations of her sphere as spiritual run a sharp line of discrimination round her range of instruction. She is commanded by the King to teach "whatsoever I have commanded you." She is ordered to "preach the word." Her field of truth is defined by the revelation which God has given, and confined to the truth there revealed and those necessary inferences which are compelled out of this truth by the laws of thought which have been established by the same divine hand and become thus the media for the expression of his will. This same principle—truth, the only instrument of government—determines the organic frame and functions of the government of the church in its specific form. It colors the administration of the legislative, executive and judicial functions. Her whole government is to be administered more or less directly by the influence of the truth, defining obedience and furnishing its motives. Obedience is to be secured by

conviction, not by compulsion in any form. The church is to legislate, judge, and execute in obedience to truth in the form of law, and its decrees are to be enforced and obedience secured solely by the weight of motives created by the truth. It is not to be coerced by power, by civil or physical disabilities. The "power of the keys" is simply power to admit to the privileges of the kingdom and to exclude from them. The fundamental law, the essential nature of a spiritual institute, runs through all its governing as well as its teaching functions. Any attempt, direct or indirect, to enforce ecclesiastical laws by civil or political penalties is a gross violation of this fundamental law of the kingdom. Any *indirect* attempt of this sort is a base and fraudulent effort to usurp, by evasion, powers which are admitted to be directly withheld from the church. It is a wicked attempt to confound the two spheres of a temporal and spiritual kingdom which have been plainly and positively severed by the authoritative dictum of the King himself.

5. Following up the lessons of the Scriptures touching the teaching function of the church, we are soon brought face to face with two great leading errors in relation to it. The first is the doctrine of a positive union between the church and the state; and the second is the ultramontane theory in the Roman Catholic Church. Touching the first of these questions, we have no call to go at length into the terrible history of spiritual disaster which has sprung from the embodiment of this theory in practice; we only wish to show the violence done by the theory to the fundamental character of a spiritual institute. The positive separation of the kingdom of Christ from the secular sphere not only prohibits the church from all interference with the functions of the state, but prohibits the state from all interference with the functions of the church. The line of distinction runs equally between both, and the force of the prohibition applies equally to both. The church is solely endowed with jurisdiction over all her officers. They are answerable to her alone for what they teach under her commission and responsibility. It is obviously just that they should be so. It is equally obvious that to guard herself from corrupt teachers the control of the revenues for their support should be in the hands of

the church, in the hands of her congregations who are to supply these revenues. If now an alliance is formed with the state, under whose terms the revenues of the ministry are in the hands of the state and altogether beyond the control of the church, it is obvious that the control of the church over the teaching of her officers is broken down; her discipline is ruined; her guarantees of sound doctrine are destroyed; her autonomy is abolished, and all her spiritual functions are suspended. The conclusion is irresistible that the spiritual character of the church absolutely prohibits a union between the church and the state. Such a policy annihilates the authoritative separation of the spheres ordained by Christ. No wonder mischief always follows in the course of such dangerous disregard of divine legislation.

The same principle prohibits all attempts of the church to control the administration of the state. It cuts the root of all the ultramontane usurpations of the Roman See. It sweeps away the foundation of all attempts of the church to control human action in the civil sphere—to prescribe policy to government, or the use of civil and political franchises to the private citizen. It is claimed in the broadest terms by the ultramontane party in the Roman Church that the church has been empowered to teach *authoritatively* and *infallibly* what is the law as well as the gospel of God; to define absolutely the *duties* of men in every relation of life; to prescribe the line of conduct in the personal, domestic, civil and political spheres of human society. This is the principle by which the tremendous despotism of Popery has been established. The right to determine authoritatively the law of God brings under the control of the determining body all that is covered by the claims of that law. But the law of God extends over every possible action of every individual human being, in all the relations of human life, at every moment of existence. The ultramontane claim then subjects the whole human race forever to the orders of the church, and an universal despotism is established in her hands. There are certain modifications of this right in the church to teach the law which have a certain currency among Protestants. As sometimes stated, it cannot be distinguished from the Romanist doctrine, though it is qualified into something distinguishably different

when pressed with the consequences. As asserted, it defines the right of the church to follow up the moral distinction wherever it is found, and to handle and legislate on all subjects in which it is found. In both of these theories there is an element of truth. The church has the right to teach the whole law of God; but the error in the Protestant abuse of it is in the conception that the right to teach the moral distinction carries with it the right of discretionary dealing with every subject in which it inheres. It is obvious that the rule of incidence to ecclesiastical matter would fix a safe limit to the handling of such subjects; but without such a recognized rule it is obvious that the teaching of the moral distinction would warrant the teaching of any and all subjects whatever in the pulpits of the christian church. The Romanist abuse of the right of the church to teach the law is a more serious and dangerous departure from the truth.

This error is, not in the right of the church to teach, but first in the claim that the church, in her strictly official capacity, is *the sole judge* of moral distinctions; and secondly, in the claim that her dictum is absolutely authoritative and binding in the sense of a positive obligation upon all other parties whatever. The Protestant sense of an authoritative decision by the church on any point of doctrine or duty is very different. Such a decision is only an official determination as to what the views of the church are, but carries no claim to coerce belief beyond the force of the evidence she presents. The ultramontane conception of an authoritative decision carries the notion of a compulsory bond to accept it, repudiating all right to question or examine, much less to refuse to accept it, and involving instant implication in guilt and responsibility if prompt adhesion to the decision of the church is refused. This peremptory and haughty assumption, coupled with the universal range of the claim over all events and relations of life, marks a theory of church power absolutely different from that right of instruction carried by the apostolic commission. Surely there is cause, an infinitely weighty reason, for a deliberate attempt to develop the boundary between the admitted right of the church to teach and this overshadowing tyranny which is confounded with it.

The first fatal objection to the ultramontane theory is that the claim to an authoritative decision as to what is truth in the ultramontane sense is that it is absolutely inconsistent with the very nature of a spiritual institute. Such an institute aims solely at a spiritual impression: its only instrument is the truth; its purpose is to govern by *conviction* and a true persuasion of the hearts of men. It by no means follows as a logical or necessary conclusion, that in assigning instruction in his truth to his kingdom Christ has repudiated the fundamental principle of that kingdom, *obedience from conviction*, government by the truth, and established a court of decision by authority. Such an idea sweeps away the very conception of the church as a convincive and spiritual institution. The ultramontane theory involves an apostasy in the church from its fundamental character.

A second objection to it is that it sweeps away the great line of distinction between the spheres of human duty as drawn by Jesus in his definition of his kingdom, and, in spite of his careful vindication of the indestructible freedom of the kingdom of Cæsar and all other secular spheres, everything is subjected to the control of the church. "The secular order exists only for the spiritual, personified in the Sovereign Pontiff, and should in all respects be subjected to it."¹ "Therefore all that which regards the law of God, conscience, eternal salvation, the whole world, nations and individuals, sovereigns and subjects, are subordinated to the power of the church and of her chief. Hence, also, in all that which interests conscience, civil legislation is subordinated to the legislation of the Catholic Church."² From this springs the audacious claim to depose princes and absolve their subjects from their allegiance, an authority asserted as "the inherent right" of the church.³ The independence of the secular spheres is annihilated, equally with the restricted sphere of the spiritual kingdom, by this desperate usurpation of papal tyranny.

A third objection to it is that it destroys that free action of intelligence and will which is guaranteed by the very nature of a

¹ *Brownson's Review*, July, 1852. Quoted in *Baltimore Critic*, p. 148.

² *Rohrbacher's History*, cited by Brownson. See *Baltimore Critic*, p. 179.

³ Same, pp. 149-176.

spiritual institute as a government by truth and conviction. The very nature of its appeal asserts the indestructible freedom of the intelligence to which it appeals, and the moral worthlessness of an adhesion to the kingdom not grounded in honest belief and consent of faculties. Acceptance of a mere authoritative decision is the natural opposite of an intelligent and free assent; and the ultramontane theory not only alters the whole character of the kingdom, but degrades the nature of the being it seeks to influence, and makes his adhesion to the kingdom a reproach to his moral and intellectual nature. The true function of teaching as conferred by Christ upon his church necessarily regards and honors the inherent rights of reason and conscience: it provides for their full contentment.

A fourth objection to this theory is that it destroys the limitations placed upon the teaching function of the church itself, and abolishes the rights of instruction conferred upon other parties. The church, as the appointed teacher of the truth, is not without limitations clearly defined in regard to her teaching. The first limitation is in regard to the *nature of the truth* she is to inculcate. She is rigidly confined to spiritual truth, and can handle secular truth only so far as it is strictly incidental and necessary to the teaching of her legitimate subjects. The second limitation is found in the investiture of the right of instruction within her own organization. Within the church itself the *official right* to teach is invested in the teaching presbyter, and no one has a right to teach as of official authority unless invested by regular ordination with the teaching office. The restriction bars as against any other office in the church as well as against the private member, and against any altogether outside of the church. No elder or deacon or private member has any right to assume the function of the teaching elder. The ruling elder is ordained to rule, and he can lawfully do nothing more under his official obligations. The deacon is ordained to take care of the poor, the widow and the orphan, and to administer the finance of the church, and he can lawfully do nothing more. The official teaching of the truth is confined to the office of the teaching presbyter, and his teachings are not without marked limitations. He is not empowered to

teach authoritatively in the sense of being empowered to command and enforce the acceptance of his instruction by any species of penal power whatever, civil or ecclesiastical. Such a claim is barred by the very nature of a spiritual institute, by the very nature of his instrument, which is simply the truth, and by the very nature of the influence he is set to produce—*conviction and assent*. The intrinsic freedom of human intelligence and responsibility is fully recognized by the whole nature of the christian propaganda, and this indelible freedom of human agency *necessarily limits the authoritative capacity* of the teaching presbyter. His authority is confined to a legal investiture with the obligation and right to declare the truth committed to his charge, as that truth is understood by the church which has commissioned him. The only compulsion he is authorized to use is the compelling power of truth, reason and pathetic persuasion—the legitimate compulsion of an appeal to the judgment, the conscience and the emotions of the soul. He is not set to be “a lord over God’s heritage.” He has “no dominion over the faith of God’s people”; he is only the “helper of their joy.” He is to do his work by “reasoning out of the Scriptures” and by “testifying to the grace of God.” His work is done, his commission is discharged, when he has expounded the word of the Lord, addressed the intelligence of his hearers, and proclaimed the will of the King. Their responsibility then comes into play, and to their own master they stand or fall according to the manner in which they receive the truth and obey or disobey it. The claim of the papal power to coerce the reception and obedience of the truth, even by the sword of the civil magistrate as the servant of the spiritual authority, is an outrageous tyranny from which the church is debarred by the fundamental principle of the kingdom of God: rule by the truth and by nothing else.

There is yet another limitation upon the teaching function of the church in its teaching offices: it is limited by the *common right* of investigating and declaring the truth vested in every other officer and member of the church; yea, in every human being to whom the knowledge of the truth comes, whether in or out of the church. All who are authorized to use the means of grace established to lead men to reconciliation with God are endowed with a

divinely authorized right to read the Word of God, which is one of that series of means. To prohibit, limit, or condition this right, is not only rebellion against God, but robbery of the chances of salvation to man. The Scriptures say of themselves they were written that men might believe, and believing have life through the name of Jesus. All who have a right to believe have a right to use the means of faith. The command is given even to the enemies of the truth to "search the Scriptures." The Bereans searched them to test the teaching of inspired apostles; they were commended for doing it, and the result was that many of them believed. Every one who hears the proclamation of the divine amnesty is expressly authorized to say, Come. What men learn from the Word of God they may repeat. Parents are expressly commanded to teach the truth to their children, when they go in and go out, when they rise up or sit down. The master may teach his servants, a friend his friend, a Sabbath-school teacher his scholars. A private christian may not only teach in private, but may lawfully address a public audience. An elder or a deacon may do the same in the exercise of his franchise, though not of his public office. All this class of instruction is sharply discriminated from the *official teaching* of the teaching presbyter, and when suitably protected from abuse and from all semblance of intrusion upon the functions of the official ministry is altogether proper. The two modes of teaching are distinguished by the one being the discharge of an official function, the other of an individual right. The one is a matter of liberty or of obligation purely personal; the other is a matter of permanent and official obligation. All private christians are not bound to address audiences in public; the vast class of female believers are expressly prohibited from it. All ministers of the church are bound to preach publicly and from house to house. It is clear, then, that other parties beside the teaching presbyter are authorized to teach in these private relations, while strictly restrained from intrusion on the office of the ministry. It follows, then, irresistibly that neither the teaching presbyter nor the courts of the church in his behalf have any right to abolish the obligation where such obligation exists, or to restrain the liberty where such privilege exists,

or to interfere in any way with the use of non-official, yet divinely given rights of instruction conferred upon other parties. The official teaching of the church does not trench upon the rights and duties of such parties, and is consequently *just so far limited and restrained by them*. The ultramontane theory abolishes all these individual rights. It claims to subject all learning and teaching of religious truth whatever to the jurisdiction of the church. It claims to condition or prohibit the reading of the Scriptures and all study or report of the truths of the christian system. It is thus again convicted of tyranny towards man and rebellion against the will and law of God.

There is yet another limitation to the teaching function of the church which sweeps away the last vestige of support for the ultramontane despotism, and also its modified Protestant form. The papal claim asserts for the church an unlimited right as *the sole judge in morals and religion*. The modified Protestant form of the claim asserts for the church the right to handle at discretion matters in which the moral distinction inheres. Both ground upon the admitted right of the church to teach the whole law of God. But there is a limitation which, while it admits the right of the church to teach the whole law and range of morals, positively *denies the sole right of the church to judge and declare the moral distinction*. It thus logically overthrows the ultramontane despotism altogether and restrains a too-adventurous Protestant zeal by asserting the claim of other parties than the church to examine and conclude matters relegated to them and as such excluded from the handling of the church. This limitation is found in the authoritative distinction in spheres decreed by divine law and the consequent investiture of other parties to determine the moral element involved in the matter assigned to these spheres distinct from the church. This uproots the claim for the church as the sole judge of morals, and it destroys the asserted right to handle ecclesiastically matters not assigned to ecclesiastical jurisdiction. This limitation is illustrated by the conduct of our Lord when asked to adjudicate in a question of property. To the request to interfere and make one brother divide an inheritance with another, he refused in the half-indignant inquiry: "Who made me a judge or a

divider over you?" Here was a question in which a moral element was strongly involved; a gross injustice may have been involved, yet Christ refused to touch it. Why did he refuse? This act of the King in Zion is plainly instructive on two points holding a vital relation to the question of the relation of his kingdom to secular matters. It plainly indicated that where a secular matter was to be decided, even though a marked moral element was involved in it, he deemed it improper for him to interfere, because it was no part of his business to determine secular matters. If the issue to be settled was secular, it was aside from his province, even though the settlement was to come through the settlement of the moral quality inhering in it. This determines the impropriety of his church seeking to control secular matters because of the moral interests involved in them, because this rule of action would justify ecclesiastical interference to an extent perilous to the authoritative distinction between the temporal and the spiritual spheres. If the Head of the church refused to interfere in such issues, what right has his church to do it? The other point settled by this example of Jesus is that where other parties, say a civil magistracy, were empowered to determine secular affairs, *it was also their province to settle the moral question involved in them.* This is equally true of other matters determinable in the civil sphere besides civil government proper. If men in the civil or secular sphere have the right to form associations for lawful, social or personal advantage, they have the right to consider and decide the moral question of their propriety. Now, if the example of our Lord in this question of property referred to him determined that the moral question of justice in the case was lawfully referred to other parties for decision, it is obvious that his church is not the sole judge of morals, and the ultramontane claim is demolished. If he refused to meddle with a secular matter in spite of the moral quality inhering in it, the loose claim of mistaken Protestants to deal at discretion with secular matters *because* of the moral quality involved in them is likewise discredited.

These four great limitations on the teaching function of the church are altogether sufficient to guard the freedom of the individual and the independence of all lawful secular spheres from

ultramontane tyranny and from mistaken conceptions among Protestant bodies touching the extent of lawful ecclesiastical interference with secular affairs.

6. From this radical distinction between the kingdom of this world and the kingdom not of this world, the dominion of Cæsar and the dominion of Christ, will issue the settlement of some of the practical questions of our own day, if it is resolutely applied. The two species of kingdom differ in their ends and differ in their means, so that neither has the right to pursue the ends or employ the means belonging to the other. A thing ascertained to belong to the temporal sphere, whether it be end or means, is thereby excluded from the spiritual, and whatever is assigned to the spiritual sphere is thereby excluded from the jurisdiction of the temporal. Nor does it at all qualify this law of the spheres of action determined by the law of God, that all things temporal have a moral side, and all things moral have something of a temporal side. That fact only makes it more difficult to run the line of distinction in spheres with precision in many cases, but it does not abolish that line and merge the spheres into unity. The kingdom of Christ is still not a kingdom of this world, and Cæsar still has a claim to the things which are Cæsar's, and God to the things which are God's. However difficult it may be to define a principle of interpretation which shall be at once logically perfect and practically effective as soon as applied in any and every particular case, the question to which sphere a given thing is to be referred will not be difficult of solution in actual practical judgments. It will often be found easier to assign the sphere to which a thing belongs than to induce the honest acceptance and execution of its legitimate consequences, especially in cases where it may be both church and state have been thoroughly committed to a policy discredited by those consequences. Such a question is the system of secular education in this country, and the question of union between church and state in all Europe. If it is indeed practically impossible to determine to what sphere a thing belongs, the distinction so emphatically asserted by our Lord between his kingdom and a kingdom of this world is absolutely impracticable and useless. But this is inadmissible, and the force of the imperative principle, that

what belongs to either sphere is excluded from the other, except all those common rights in things essential to the working of both, is not at all impaired.

The fundamental spiritual character of the church of God runs through all its functions of teaching and every department of its government, legislative, judicial and executive. Its ends are negatively defined as not physical or temporal well-being, and positively defined as moral and religious well-being. Its power is negatively defined as not compulsory, and positively defined as convince and persuasive. Its instrument is negatively defined as not physical force, and positively defined as truth and nothing but the truth. No physical force backs its teaching, its legislation, its judicial decisions, or its executive enterprises. Its laws and judgments, its executive energies, its appeals for work and revenue, are only enforced by the truth in the form of law or demonstrated duty. Its culture of moral obedience and religious affections, its development of purity in motive, holiness in character and righteousness in conduct, depend not on force or interested suggestions, but on the force of the truth in the form of an instrument to convince and persuade. Let us attempt to apply these principles of a spiritual kingdom to some of the questions of the day. Some of these questions concern the relations of the church to civil government proper, and others lie in the general sphere of secular matters distinct altogether from civil government. We will study them in succession.

7. Relation of the church to rights and obligations in the individual, domestic and social sphere of civil society.

(1.) The spiritual character of the church determines a restriction on the church in relation to the *incidental effects of its own proper work*. The teaching of the gospel is full of fruit which is the mere incidental result of its influence. The conversion of a human soul, the infusion of holiness into its moral energies, the establishment of the divine law as a practical rule of action, will exert a commanding influence over all the relations and energies of the man. It will make him a better man in every relation and qualify his energies, however employed. But many of these relations are outside the sphere of the church: they extend into the

private, domestic, social and political spheres, and are thereby excluded from the domain of the church. In such things as the management and education of children, the reading and study of the man, the selection of a profession, the selection of associates, and the formation of party affiliations in politics, the church has no right to dictate. Her purifying influence will control him in the use of such things, but the right to determine that use is his own. The only right of the church to qualify it is the right of discipline for abuses of personal privilege inconsistent with christian character and with vows of obedience to Christ. Nor has the church the right to designedly and directly attempt the development of these incidental and uncommanded objects which result from the discharge of her proper commission; for they lie in other spheres, and to designedly attempt them by direct use of her powers would involve a departure from her bounds.

(2.) The spiritual character of the church determines its relation to the rightful use of both duties and lawful liberties or privileges of other parties, in many things—in domestic management, in combinations for social advantage and moral reformations. The church can only teach duty or define moral and warranted privilege in its general form: the particular decision touching the discharge of the duty or the use of the privilege in any separate sphere is to be made in that sphere itself. Among these questions of privilege are such matters as public libraries, lyceums, social charities, the treatment of animals, the legal and police protection of wives and children, Masonic associations and trades' unions. These things are civil and secular in their main purpose: they are all incidentally moral to a greater or less degree. The fact that they are civil in their main end and purpose consigns them to the civil sphere, and excludes them from the domain of the church. Their incidental moral bearing by no means warrants the withdrawal of jurisdiction over them from the civil power and the consignment of them to the control of the church. The church is warranted to teach that a good man is merciful to his beast; but it has no right to determine what civil measures are to be taken to protect animals. The determination of the question whether any member or officer of the church may unite to form or join a Masonic associa-

tion, a particular social charity, a lyceum or public library association, is purely a personal right. Such acts belong to the sphere of moral liberty or privilege or duty purely personal: they belong to man in his individual and social capacity. Any such question is referred absolutely to his personal decision, and this carries with it the right to determine, on his own responsibility, the question of moral propriety involved in it. It is bootless to allow any rights, individual or social, if they are always to be conditioned by the dictum of the church. They belong to a domain civil, from which the church is excluded by her own essential character as spiritual. The war of the Roman Catholic Church on the Masonic association, and the prohibition of her members to join it, is an unwarranted usurpation upon their personal rights, and an intrusion beyond the lawful bounds of a spiritual institute.

The relation of the church to societies for reform is settled by the same rule. In many parts of this country the church assumes a relation to temperance societies which is utterly unwarranted by her true relations to all such associations for moral reforms. It assumes to require a pronounced friendship for any form of temperance organization and an adhesion to their principle of total abstinence, or a positive union with them, as essential to good standing in the church, and in some cases to the recognized character of a christian and the privilege of communion. Temperance societies in their various forms, Washingtonian, Total Abstinence, Sons of Temperance, or Women's Christian Temperance Unions, Anti-Gambling Associations, Associations for the Promotion of Purity, are all of the nature of means to an end. That end may be proper; it may be so far forth absolutely coincident with the end of the church; both seek the suppression of a vice. But each seeks the end, if they properly seek it, by different means. The church is authorized to seek it only by the use of her own divinely appointed and commanded ordinances. The associations seek it by their own selected influences. All these societies, then, are of the nature of *means*; and not only so, but means adopted in the use of that liberty of choice which belongs to the individual. The end may lie in the sphere of duty; the means may be merely in the region of privilege, the domain of allowable but

not obligatory action, or in the region of specific but not universal obligation. The liberty to adopt any particular means implies the liberty to reject it and choose other expedients. The most fanatical zealot of temperance would probably allow that there was no imperative general obligation on a member of the old Total Abstinence Society to join the modern order of the Good Templars. He would be at liberty to do it, but that is all. The church has no right to curb a liberty by a law. As a true moral liberty, it already has the sanction of law. If any *positive* moral obligation exists upon any particular person to join any one or all of these associations for the suppression of any one vice or more, that obligation is personal and particular, and the church has no right to expand such a limited obligation into universal law. Masonic bodies, Odd-Fellows, Temperance Societies, Anti-Gambling Associations, may be all right as means to serve the ends of charity and pure living, but they are all in the civil sphere, and as such excluded from the sphere and patronage of the church. But the church, acting in her own legitimate bounds, though seeking the same end, is bound to seek it exclusively by her own commanded means and ordinances; nor has she any right to try to enforce any other means whatever upon her officers or members. If she does, she violates her spiritual charter, her fundamental law.

What is true of *liberty* or *privilege* inhering in other spheres is equally true in regard to *positive duties* similarly placed. The church has no right in its teaching capacity to interfere with the duty of any other party authorized to judge the moral distinction, to learn, judge, teach and enforce that distinction. It has no right in its judicial, legislative or executive capacity to interfere with the duties assigned to other spheres. If, for instance, the duty of the education of children, either secular or religious, has been assigned to the parental relation, the church is not empowered to meddle with it. She may teach the child religious truth by her ordinary agencies, but she has no right to enforce even religious instruction contrary to the convictions and will of the parent. The responsibility is his and his alone. Still less is the church empowered to control the secular education of the child, for that is exclusively assigned to the parental relation. Any

duty or any privilege attached to any other domain is *ex vi termini* excluded from the domain of a spiritual kingdom.

8. Relation of the church to civil government proper, and the mutual duties of the two species of kingdoms.

The spiritual character of the church, while establishing a fundamental difference between it and a kingdom of this world, is nevertheless entirely consistent with certain duties it owes to the state, and the state is equally bound in certain duties to the church. The tendency of the existing dispute in reference to the union of the Northern and Southern Presbyterian Churches has been to create the impression that the Southern Church in its strong exceptions to the latitudinarian action of the Northern Church does not recognize any political duties in the spiritual kingdom at all. This is altogether a mistake. The records of the Southern Church courts bear witness to the firm discharge of its political duties, and this circumstance has been unfairly employed by partisan writers in the interests of the organic union proposition, as a fair offset and even a greater violence to the spiritual character of the church than any political misdemeanor in the action of the Northern body. The fact that the Southern courts have dealt with political matter is construed as implicating them in the very abuse of which they complain, and in view of their emphatic assertion of the non-secular nature of the christian kingdom, this implication is asserted to involve both absurdity and guilt. That such a view should have been taken by shallow thinkers, who can see no difference between a proper and an improper dealing with political matter, and accept any dealing with political obligations as involving an unlimited claim to political action, is not strange; but that it should have imposed on some of the best thinkers in the church on both sides is certainly curious. The tendency in the Southern Church in consequence of this is to run to an extreme opposite to the Northern extreme, and to suppose that there is no consistent assertion of the non-secular character of the church without condemning all political deliverances whatever. A brief examination of the teachings of the Scriptures, and a just application of the admitted functions of both church and state, will correct the error upon both sides, and show that the just complaint raised touching the abuse

of the spiritual character of the church is not that the church in both sections of the country has touched upon political duties, but that in one case at least these political deliverances have entirely transcended the duty of the church, and by so doing have violated its spiritual character. The church is plainly required in the Scriptures to do certain duties to the state, and these duties when done involve no breach whatever on its true spiritual sphere.

9. Duties of the church to the state.

(1.) The church is positively required to inculcate *the duty of obedience to "the powers that be."* This obligation is created by the plain words of the Holy Spirit, and is obligatory on the church in her courts and pulpits alike. "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake. For, for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor."¹ "Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work."² The duty of the church is here plain and positive. She is to teach obedience to "the powers that be," no matter what they may be. She is to inculcate obedience to every *de facto* government. From this requisition in the inspired record spring several incisive and far-reaching principles, negative and positive, regulative of the duty of the church to the state.

(2.) The church is clearly prohibited from raising any ques-

¹ Rom. xiii. 1-7.

² Titus iii. 1.

tion concerning the legitimate *title* of any civil government under which she may be founded. She is intended to exist in every nation of the earth and under every government, and is prohibited from raising any question touching legitimacy of title. Her bond is to government *de facto* just as she finds it. The question of legitimacy of title in the claim of government is a secular matter, to be settled solely in the secular sphere. The humiliating issue of the attempt of the English Church to uphold the divine right of the Stuart dynasty illustrates the folly of the church undertaking to settle the legitimate title of a civil government and of thus passing her legitimate bounds.

(3.) The church is prohibited from adhering as of divine or spiritual authority to any one particular form of civil government as specially obligatory under the law of God. Her duty is to the powers that be, no matter what they may be. Kings, emperors, consuls, chief magistracies of every sort, republics of every form, are all alike entitled at her hands to recognition as powers that be. All are in the same sense ordained of God. The question of form in civil government is a secular question to be settled in the civil sphere, and is thereby absolutely excluded from the spiritual kingdom.

(4.) As a further consequence of her spiritual character, the church has no right to dispute or perpetuate or guarantee the territorial limits of any country in which she may exist. Designed to exist under every government, no matter what its form may be, and to occupy every country in the world, whether its territorial domain is large or small, she is rigidly excluded from handling all such questions. The establishment of territorial bounds is a secular matter, alone cognizable in the secular sphere of political power, and is thereby excluded from the jurisdiction of the church. All consideration of such issues by the church is a mark of apostasy from her divine commission.

(5.) The church is bound to inculcate the lawfulness of coercive power in civil governments, and teach that the magistrate "beareth not the sword in vain." She is to teach her people to recognize him as "the minister of God for good," and to obey him for conscience' sake as well as from fear of wrath, and give him honor as

one to whom honor is due. She is not to approve the coercive forces of government in a war of conquest or revenge, or except for just and necessary ends, but is entitled to bear testimony against such policy, because she is entitled to testify against all moral wrongs. But she is bound to uphold the exertion of coercive power in civil governments in all just and necessary wars for the safety and protection of the people from the tyranny and abuse of evil men. In this lesson that the sword is not borne in vain or empty show, there is no departure from her sphere as a kingdom not of this world.

(6.) The church as the teacher of moral obligations may lawfully teach that treason against the government is a crime, but only under limitations. Treason as a political crime is differently defined under the laws of different governments, and under its civil definition is not always a crime against God. Nay, technical treason may sometimes be the highest of virtues, as where a patriot imperils life and honor in the rescue of his country. Washington was technically a traitor; he was actually a noble example of public virtue. The church has no right to pronounce treason a crime unless it is a violation of the divine not less than of human law. If it involves an unnecessary and unjustifiable breach of the divine law, which requires obedience to the bearer of the sword of civil justice and the powers that be, the church has the right to pronounce treason a crime against God as well as against human law, but not otherwise. Technical treason belongs altogether to the civil sphere, and the church has nothing to do with it. Her condemnation of a technical traitor may involve the condemnation of the noblest virtue.

(7.) The church is prohibited by her essential nature as a spiritual body from all interference with the decisions of magistrates on the bench, of statesmen in council, of legislators in parliaments, and of the private citizen in his political action. This restriction is created by the limitation on the teaching function of the church arising from the coördinate right of other parties to judge and determine the moral element in things assigned to their responsibility. To deny this right and yet to impute this responsibility to such parties, is absurd. The obligation to determine the civil

or secular question carries with it the duty and consequent right of determining the moral question implicated in it, or else the civil responsibility cannot be determined by the person on whom that responsibility rests, which is absurd and contradictory. It is at once to impute responsibility and deny it. It is to impose responsibility and at the same time disable it by disabling the settlement of a question absolutely essential to that settlement. For the church to claim the determination of this controlling moral question is to claim jurisdiction over the secular or civil matter in which it is involved. But this is absurd and contradictory; for it has been already recognized that this responsibility is in the individual in his secular relation, and it is contradictory to impute it to the church. The church cannot assume it without usurpation and a trespass beyond her spiritual sphere. The church may teach the moral duty of a civil magistrate *in thesi*; but to assume to dictate duty to a judge upon the bench and in his official action, is to assume control over his official act. He must decide the justice of the case himself or betray his duty. Any constitution which directly or indirectly subjects the civil magistrate to the dictum of the church, or to ecclesiastical penalties for disregarding the teaching of the church in any particular case, is a constitution fundamentally vicious. The state possessing such a constitution is the vassal of the church. The church which seeks or permits such relations to the civil magistrate is at once tyrannical and corrupt: she invades a sphere from which she is precluded and betrays her own. The decision of judicial matters is assigned to the civil magistrate. For similar reasons, political matters are assigned to the political sphere, social matters to the social sphere, and domestic matters to the domestic sphere. The distinction is clear between the right of the church to teach morals, and the right to enforce her views upon one under distinct personal or official responsibility, in the civil or political or domestic or social sphere, by any form of ecclesiastical penalty. To do this is usurpation, tyranny, and a violation of her spiritual character. The church may teach duty in its general form; the particular decision of its application in any distinct sphere of right and responsibility is to be made in that sphere itself.

(8.) The church is required to uphold the right of taxation in civil government as essential to the existence and efficiency of "this minister of God for good." "For, for this cause pay ye tribute also; render tribute to whom tribute is due." The lawless abuse of this power may be lawfully censured by the church, as she may lawfully testify against any great wickedness; and neither the support of a lawful power of taxation nor just testimony against its abuse is any departure from the spiritual sphere of the kingdom of God.

(9.) The church is required "to pray for kings and all who are in authority," that the people may live in all godliness and honesty. In her private and family devotions, in her assemblies for public worship, on ordinary and extraordinary occasions, she is so bound to pray; and to do it is no departure from the spiritual law.

(10.) The church is bound to give counsel upon matters of a moral and religious nature when thereto invited by the civil magistrate. The Confession of Faith says plainly: "Synods and councils are to handle or conclude nothing but that which is ecclesiastical; and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth, unless by way of humble petition in cases extraordinary, or by way of advice for satisfaction of conscience, if they be thereunto required by the civil magistrate."¹ In this paragraph the right of the church to advise the state is limited, *first*, to moral and religious matter in which conscience is involved; and *second*, by the previous request of the civil authority for counsel. It is excluded from all advice on any political or civil aspect of the subject, and confined to its moral or religious side altogether. The right to advise, thus limited, is clearly within the bounds of the true sphere of the spiritual kingdom.

(11.) The church is recognized in the Standards as possessed of a right to petition government in "cases extraordinary." These cases extraordinary are recognized as belonging to the civil sphere and not merely to matters moral and religious. If the proposal was made in this country to establish a union of some branch of

¹ *Confession of Faith*, Chap. XXXI., Sec. 4.

the church with the government of the United States, no one, we presume, would question the right of all other branches of the church to petition the government in relation to it. It would be on one side a civil matter concerning greatly the interests of the commonwealth, and on the other a grave implication of the interests of the church. But does this paragraph warrant the presentation of a petition to a state legislature or convention asking for a law prohibitory of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors? It is true that the moral and the physical interests of the people are involved in it. So far as moral interests are involved, they are also seriously involved in the theatre: would that justify the church in petitioning for the prohibition of theatrical performances? Moral interests are involved in the influence of a certain class of newspapers: would that justify the church in asking for legal restraints on the freedom of the press? So far as physical interests of the people are concerned, these are in chief the concern of the commonwealth, just as sanitary laws and quarantine regulations are. Physical interests are involved in various kinds of business, as in the trade of the glass-cutter and in the manufacture of chemicals. If the church is not warranted in petitioning government in relation to sanitary and quarantine regulations, or asking for the suppression of all trades unfriendly to health and physical safety, is she warranted in petitioning for the prohibition of all dealing with intoxicating drinks on this ground of physical well-being? Yet further; admitting the right to petition for the prohibition of certain kinds of intoxicating liquors, is she warranted in petitioning for a law which would, at the same time, exclude a kind whose use is warranted by the Word of God? The distinction which regulates the action of the church in relation to acts of legislature bearing upon moral and physical well-being, is the same which regulates her relation to private associations for the same ends. An act of legislature or a social combination for the suppression of any vice is *a means to an end*. The end may be moral and obligatory, and so far coincident with the end of the church; but the *means* may lie in the region of liberty, privilege and free choice, or in the civil sphere altogether. The obligation to seek the end by no means carries the obligation to

support any and every means which may be adopted lawfully to carry the end. The end may be sought by different means—by different means in different spheres only there appropriate. An order of Templars or of Sons may be a perfectly just means in the social sphere to suppress the vice of drunkenness. A prohibitory law may be a just means for this purpose in the civil sphere. The church may lawfully seek it in the use of her own appointed means; but so far as her relation to other means is concerned, she is strictly limited by a due regard to her spiritual character. She has no right to either teach, legislate, or judicially determine that it is the duty of her members to join or support any one or all of these associations, or to vote in their political capacity for such a law. Means to the end lying in the social or civil sphere are beyond her bounds, and are not subject to her approval or disapproval. In the case of secular societies, they are matters of liberty and privilege, not of obligation, and the church has nothing to do with the legitimate use of a legitimate privilege. *In the case of legislation by the state, she has no right to intervene, because the state has the sole right to judge of civil matters and of the moral element involved in them. The right of the church to petition in relation to a prohibition law is discredited, *first*, by the general fact that legislative means to any end lie wholly in the civil sphere, and *secondly*, by the special fact that the trade in intoxicants does not belong to “cases extraordinary”: it has been one of the regular employments of society for thousands of years. It is a trade which ought to be rigorously restrained, but this legislative restraint is a matter to be handled and concluded solely in the civil and social sphere. The war of the church upon it ought to be confined to her own divinely appointed means: for she is in lawful possession of no other.

(12.) The church is prohibited by her spiritual character from forming such relations to the state as will either give the church power to guide the policy of the state or the state power to interfere with the rights and duties of the church. All union of church and state is prohibited by the spiritual character of the church. The church may teach the general duty of the state to make just laws, but it is not at liberty to dictate any law to the legislature

as just. It has no right to expect, demand or contrive that the state shall levy tax for its support. Its spiritual character requires all its revenue to come from the free offerings of its members, in obedience to the truth in the form of law divine. Especially has the church no shadow of a right to subsidize the coercive power of the state to compel men to accept her doctrine and yield to her dominion. She has been prohibited from all coercion by her very nature as a spiritual institute, and to indirectly employ the secular arm is a base evasion of her fundamental duty which merits condemnation as a fraud as well as a tyrannical usurpation. The unctuous deprecation of all right in the church to shed human blood when the Roman Catholic Church turns over the victims of her *auto's da fe* to the secular power merits the indignant scorn of every honorable mind.

(13.) Lastly, wherever there are two governments coëxisting over the same people on the same territory, and any question of precedent claim springs up between them, it is no part of the business of the church to determine that issue. This is a special form of the prohibition upon the church to settle any question of title already discussed or to take any part in the foundation of any government. This was one of the grave errors of the Spring Resolutions, which have proved so grave an obstacle to the organic union movement now in agitation, but not the only one. Four distinct breaches of the spiritual character of the church were involved in those resolutions. They proclaimed the "obligations to promote and perpetuate the integrity of these United States," which involved a breach of the church's prohibition to guarantee the territory of any country in which it may be founded. They asserted the right to "uphold and encourage the government in the exercise of all its functions," where the functions thus exercised were military functions in a war of conquest. They asserted the adhesion of the church, by its divine authority and in the exercise of its divinely appointed powers, to a particular constitution of civil government, contrary to its character as a spiritual institute equally designed to exist under every constitution of civil government. Lastly, it settled the disputed question of priority of claim as between the government of the United States and the

governments of the States, and determined the question to which the allegiance of the private citizen was primarily due. On the other hand, the record of the Southern Presbyterian Church has been deliberately assailed as the worst of the two.¹ But so far is this from being true, every political act of the Southern Church courts, taken in their true intent, has been in conformity with either the political or moral duties positively required of the church in the Word of God. It is no credit to the discrimination or justness of judgment in those who can see no difference between political acts of the church in conformity with its duties and in consistency with its spiritual character, and political acts of the church in violation of both, and who condemn both as equally guilty, as equally tampering with matters political. There are matters political with which the church may lawfully interfere; there are others with which it cannot lawfully interfere. To confound the two is absurd.

10. Duties of the state to the church.

These duties may be more summarily stated. The Standards of the church set them forth with sufficient directness and point.² The following series of statements will set them in more detail:

(1.) The state is bound to protect the church in all its rights of worship and in its obedience to the laws of God. It has no right to prevent the administration and discipline of the church, according to the laws of God, over its own members voluntarily subjecting themselves to its jurisdiction, but over no other persons whatever.

(2.) The state is bound to prevent the tyranny of sect over sect, to protect the good name and person of all her people from injury or abuse on account of their faith, and to guard the rights of conscience from all coercion or other disturbance.

(3.) It is required to protect all the property of the church lawfully acquired and held, and to prevent every attempt to destroy it or to alienate it from its lawful owners.

(4.) It is bound to protect the property of the church from all perversion from the uses for which it was given. All church property is of the nature of a public charity as well as lawful pro-

¹ Dr. Baird's pamphlet.

² *Confession of Faith*, Chap. XXIII.

perty, because it is the gift of charitable and religious persons for the religious benefit of mankind, and all such persons have a right to designate what particular form of religious belief they consider it a worthy charity to tender to their fellow-beings. All church property is therefore fully entitled to that noble rigor of protection thrown by the English and American law around all charitable foundations.

(5.) The state has no right to levy any public or general tax for the benefit of the church or any part of it.

(6.) It has no right to form any such alliance or relation with the church or any part of it as will enable the state to control the appointment of officers or the revenue and work of the church.

(7.) The state has no right to subject its own powers or rights of decision and control to the control of the church, and emphatically no right to use its coercive power to promote the purposes of the church or compel adhesion to it.

(8.) Where many branches of the church are existing on the territory and under the protection of the state, it has no right to favor one at the expense of the other, or to throw its influence as distinguished from any form of coercion in favor of any one in particular. Nor has it the right to use the church or any part of it as a factor in politics, to promote any measure of policy or any party in politics, even under pretext of great moral issues to be settled in the civil sphere. All union between church and state, under any modification of the idea, is forever prohibited by the fundamental character and law of both church and state.

C. R. VAUGHAN.

VI. THE RELIGIOUS ROMANCES OF GEORGE MACDONALD.

WHEN George Eliot was a young woman of twenty years, and still hidden in the obscurity of an English country home, she was already giving indications of that taste for moral lecturing for which she afterwards became so famous. In one of her many preachments she thus pronounced herself: "Religious novels are more hateful to me than merely worldly ones: they are a sort of centaur or mermaid, and, like other monsters that we do not know how to class, should be destroyed for the public good as soon as born. The weapons of the Christian warfare were never sharpened at the forge of Romance."¹

The class of books against which the youthful zeal of Miss Evans thus emphatically pronounced itself belongs almost exclusively to the literature of this generation. A century or two ago romance and religion were openly at strife, and there were few indications indeed that they would ever be wed. Even morality was scarcely on terms of courtesy with fiction. The masterpieces of Fielding, Swift, and Sterne, while read by hundreds who esteemed themselves both moral and religious, certainly made no claim to a moral, much less a religious, flavor. But at the beginning of this century there came a better day. The pure hands of Sir Walter of Abbotsford, of Miss Austen, and of others wrought an easy reconciliation between romance and morality, and furnished a final proof that the former can never be so charming as when walking with the latter hand in hand. But the religious novel is a later, if not a nobler, product of the romance-maker's art.

The young moralist whose sweeping condemnation of this method was quoted above afterwards became famous for her speculative variations. She abandoned with contempt the most of her early opinions. Whether she repudiated her dislike to religious romances along with her affection for Hannah More or not, she certainly soon surrendered her objection to novels that are "merely worldly." It is certain, too, that, despite her protest, no depart-

¹ *Life and Letters of George Eliot*, by J. W. Cross.

ment in the great work-shops of fiction includes at this moment more master workmen and attracts more admiring visitors than that in which "the weapons of the Christian warfare are sharpening at the forge of Romance," or in which, out of the materials of the professional novelist, men are fashioning vehicles for the conveyance of their chosen theories of philosophy or religion. No such book, if we except the great American novel, *Ben-Hur*, and perhaps extend the exception so far as to embrace one or two others, has yet taken rank among the very greatest of the works of fiction. Yet the large sales which have certified the public approval of some books of this kind, the stories of E. P. Roe, for example, prove that the men and women of this generation do not wholly sympathize with the early dogmatism of George Eliot. It would be difficult to account for the enthusiastic reception granted to Mr. Roe's books on any other theory than that it is a popular endorsement of the method which, however illogical and unartistic it may be, substitutes for the red lights of over-wrought passion the calm and homely glow of moral and religious emotion. A cynic would mutter that the public infatuation with "The Opening of the Chestnut Burr" and "Barriers Burned Away" only supplies a mortifying proof that Carlyle was right when he declared that the men of the day are "mostly fools," and that only a generation of intellectual dyspeptics could prefer such syllabub to the fine, firm venison that strong hunters like Meredith and Howells have brought to the table. We are not satisfied that this cynical explanation accounts for the facts in question. We are convinced that the popular acceptance of books of this class rests upon some quality more creditable both to the authors and their readers than the dilute sentimentalism of the stories. Weak they may be, liable to all the charges of artistic criticism; but they appeal to some appetency of the human heart, and we know not what appetency it is if it be not the desire for fiction in which there lurks no disguised enmity to the faith which so many still count so precious.

In the preface to the last edition of "John Inglesant," Mr. Shorthouse has given the following eloquent vindication of the method which we are now considering:

"Let us try to catch something of the skill of the great masters of romance, of Cervantes and Le Sage, of Goethe and Jean Paul, and let us unite to it the most serious thoughts and speculations which have stirred mankind. If James Hinton had thrown 'The Mystery of Pain' into the form of a story, do you not think that for one sorrowful home which has been lightened by his singular genius, there would have been hundreds? that in place of one sorrowing heart to which his message has brought peace and salvation, he might have reckoned thousands?

"'But,' you say, 'it is only a romance.'

"True. It is only life in the 'highways and hedges,' and in 'the streets and lanes of the city,' with the ceaseless throbbing of its quivering heart; it is only daily life from the work-shop, from the market, and from the stage; it is only kindness and neighborhood and child-life, and the fresh wind of heaven, and the waste of sand and forest, and the sunbreak upon the stainless peaks, and the contempt of wrong and pain and death, and the passionate yearning for the face of God, and woman's tears and woman's self-sacrifice and devotion and woman's love. Yes, it is only a romance. It is only the ivory gates falling back at the fairy touch. It is only the leaden sky breaking for a moment above the bowed and weary head, revealing the fathomless Infinite through the gloom."

There can be no doubt on the mind of any reader of the novels of Dr. MacDonald that he has deliberately adopted and acted on these principles. Even to one who is ignorant of the main incidents of his personal history, it will be manifest that his prime objective in writing these romances is to formulate in a popular shape and to disseminate as widely as possible his chosen theories of philosophy and religion. Those who are aware that he was at one time a minister of the gospel, and that he has almost or quite abandoned the pulpit for the desk of the lecturer and novelist, will probably condemn him as recreant to the highest duty. But Dr. MacDonald evidently believes that his voice can be heard farther and more clearly from the chair than from the rostrum. A religious purpose is apparent in nearly, if not quite, all of his novels. We have yet to read the first in which, while we were compelled to dissent from many of his views, we were not compelled also to admit that the author was laboring for the inculcation of religious truth as he holds it, for the suppression of theoretical and practical error as he sees it, and for the application of the moral and remedial influences of the gospel to the annihilation of the sins and the alleviation of the miseries of the world. And it is our purpose in this article to examine the scope and tendencies of those religious views which Dr. MacDonald has chosen this method of disseminating, which not only illustrate his novels, but

seem to have furnished in the mind of the author their *raison d'être*.

It is quite impossible that any one who has a reverence for the forms in which the truths of divine revelation have immemorially been cast, should be satisfied with the theological system which, as far as a theological system can be constructed in a series of stories, Dr. MacDonald has thus expounded. Indeed, it is entirely likely that Dr. MacDonald would desire no stronger confirmation of his doctrinal views than the dissatisfaction which they would arouse in the mind of a professed theologian. He makes no concealment of the fact that he has an irreconcilable quarrel with the orthodox systems. He does not attempt to disguise his objections to what is known as doctrinal theology. He denounces it as founded on a blind and stupid worship of the letter. He applies to all who preach and uphold it an epithet almost identical with that which Coleridge affixed to Eliphaz, Bildad and Zophar, when he characterized them as "those orthodox liars for God." He arrays the "clergy and their traditions" in a contrast with the life and teachings of the Son of Man as hopeless as that which separated from him the Pharisee and Sadducee of his day.

Nor is it surprising that the Confession of Faith and the Shorter Catechism of the Scotch Church should be made to bear the brunt of the attack of one who goes forth to lead a crusade against orthodoxy. Against these Dr. MacDonald directs all the darts of sarcasm and invective. "Few suspected him," says he of Thomas Crann in "Alec Forbes," "of being religious beyond the degree which is commonly supposed to be the general inheritance of Scotchmen, possibly in virtue of their being brought up upon oatmeal porridge and the Shorter Catechism." And on another page of the same book he writes yet more severely: "The joy of the (Saturday) half-holiday for Scotch boys and girls has a terrible weight laid in the opposite scale—I mean the other half of the day. This weight consists in the free use of the Shorter Catechism. This, of course, makes them hate the Catechism, though I am not aware that that is of any great consequence. For my part, I wish the spiritual engineers who constructed it had, after laying the grandest foundation stone that truth could afford them, glorified

God by going no farther. Certainly many men would have enjoyed him sooner if it had not been for their work.”¹ He then adds that the proof-texts, of which the Catechism stands in great need, are “only morsels torn bleeding and shapeless from ‘the lovely form of the Virgin Truth.’” This undisguised bitterness need of course occasion us no surprise. Whatever may be thought of the tendencies of the doctrinal statements formulated in the Westminster symbols, they confessedly contain the most logical, the most systematic, the most fearless, the most uncompromising exposition of the Augustinian theology extant. To one who is essentially a humanitarian, who is a preacher of the universal divine sonship of men in a state of nature, who scouts the doctrine of the atonement as a dishonoring “lie against God,” who teaches the reasonableness and certainty of “the eternal hope,” to one whose whole objective is to awaken and foster sentiments of moral revulsion from some of the fundamental doctrines of the Protestant churches, the Westminster symbols will naturally seem the very citadel of the hated systems and sustain the angriest attack.

But it would not be worth our while to exhibit this evident purpose that informs Dr. MacDonald’s novels, did his objections limit themselves to the Scotch Presbyterian formularies. The important fact is that he cries down these symbols only because they enshrine the doctrines which he detests. And while many of these doctrines have without doubt their completest and most logical definition in the Presbyterian creed, they are not peculiar to that creed. Dr. MacDonald’s war is against the consecrated forms in which the truths of redemption have been preached and believed and loved for nearly two millenniums. Every Protestant church is placed on the defensive by his attitude. Every christian needs to apprehend a rifling of his treasures. Every believer in the atonement, in justification by faith, in adoption, in the law of the Sabbath, in the fixedness of the eternal state, is threatened with loss; for it is these fundamental doctrines that Dr. MacDonald would teach us to repudiate as lies against God.

Before proceeding to make good these assertions, it is necessary that we should call to the attention of the reader the method by

¹ *Alec Forbes, of Howglen.*

which the author's anti-orthodox opinions are usually expounded. In some of the quotations which we shall make, Dr. MacDonald speaks in his own person; in the most of them, he prefers to employ the lips of one or another of the fictitious personages who move through his narratives. In each of his novels he introduces to his reader one strong character whose mission it is to proclaim liberty to the captives of theology and opening of prisons to those bound by the cords of orthodoxy. Every reader of these books will think of Donal Grant, of Robert Falconer, of the pious shoemaker, Andrew Comin, of Malcolm and Mr. Graham, of the dwarf, Polwarth, of Mr. Walton. All these, in their doctrinal views, *are* Dr. MacDonald. Their masks are made designedly transparent. The opinions, which in conversations with other fictitious characters, they express and defend are the opinions for the inculcation of which these books were written. These facts are so manifest, that it is entirely fair to infer the author's doctrinal opinions from the speeches and arguments of these paladins of views which he often, in his own person, enunciates.

If Dr. MacDonald were asked whether or no he believes in the doctrine of the atonement, he would probably give a qualified answer. Interpreting his opinions exclusively from the religious romances under consideration, we are sure that the following would be a fair statement of his position in reference to this doctrine: Sinning man needed to be reconciled to God; the loving God never needed to be reconciled to man. The estrangement between man and his Maker is altogether on one side. The barriers which Jesus Christ came to remove consisted only in man's enmity and distrust toward his Father in heaven, and the one end of the mission of the Lord Jesus was to persuade men to think differently of his Father and their Father, and to induce them to accept his love. We find not the slightest intimation that Dr. MacDonald gives any recognition to the necessity of the atonement from the divine side, to the demands of the divine law, to the judicial attitude of God in enforcing those demands, to the substitutionary and vicarious aspect of the Redeemer's work. The name Jesus belongs to the Christ, not because he is the sin-offering for the world, and the Lamb of God slain from its foundation, but because he brings sinning men

so entirely under the influence of God's pity and love that, compelled by this influence, they willingly turn away from sin. In this system of atonement there is neither need nor room for the *blood symbol*; nothing to indicate that Jesus came "not by water only, but by water and blood." The blood of Christ is simply the token and eloquent memorial of an infinite love which, unable to attain its ends without self-immolation, freely made the sacrifice and won blood-stained trophies.

Among the many extracts which might be offered to sustain this statement of Dr. MacDonald's position on this point, the following will doubtless be found conclusive. In "Donal Grant," the most dogmatic of all these romances, a "slave of orthodoxy" is overheard by the hero, a young Scotch tutor, teaching a child as follows:

"You know, Davie dear, every sin deserves God's wrath and curse, both in this life and that which is to come, and if it hadn't been that Jesus Christ gave himself to bear the punishment for us, God would send us all to the place of misery."

Against this, Donal Grant is made to utter this indignant protest:

"Lady Arctura, I dare not sit still and hear such false things uttered against the blessed God. . . . I set to my seal that God is true, that he is light, and there is no darkness either of unfairness or selfishness or human theology in him, whatever the ministers and others may falsely teach the people concerning him. . . . I daren't hear such things without saying that whoever taught them first was a terrible liar against God."

The following conversation in dialect between Robert Falconer and his grandmother is still more conclusive:

"But, laddie, Christ cam' to satisfie God's justice by sufferin' the punishment due to oor sins; to turn aside his wrath an' curse; to reconcile him to us."

"He did naething o' the kin', grannie. It's a' a lee that. He cam' to satisfie God's justice by giein' him back his bairns; by garrin' them see that God was just; by sendin' them greetin' hame to fa' at his feet, an' grip his knees, an' say, 'Father, ye're i' the richt'. He cam' to lift the weicht o' the sins that God had curst aff o' the shoothers o' them 'at did them, by makin' them turn agen them, an' be for God an' no for sin. And there isna a word o' reconceelin' God till 's in a' the Testament, for there was no need o' that. . . . He took oor sins upo' him, for he cam' into the middle o' them, and took them up—by no sleicht o' hand, by no quibblin' o' the lawyers aboot imputin' his richteousness to us, an' sic like, which is no to be found i' the Bible at a'."

It follows, as a necessary consequence, that Dr. MacDonald's definition of the doctrines of justification and faith is equally revolutionary. In the book from which we have already quoted an extract, the author says of the Lady Arctura, "First lie of all, she had been taught that she must believe so and so before God would let her come near him or listen to her. . . . She did not see that those things she desired to believe were in themselves essential damnation. For what could there be in heaven or on earth for a soul that believed in an unjust God?" And this sober protest against the doctrine of justification by faith is presently exchanged for ridicule, as will appear from the following disingenuous dispute between the partly perverted Lady Arctura and an orthodox friend:

"The way of salvation is plain: you have but to believe that Christ died for your sins."

"But I don't know whether he died for my sins."

"He died for the sins of the whole world."

"Then I must be saved?"

"Yes, when you believe it."

"Then, I cannot be saved except I believe that I shall be saved. And I cannot believe I shall be saved until I know I shall be saved. And I shall not be saved until I believe it."

We feel almost constrained to offer an apology for citing this last passage. We have produced it only that it may exemplify the unfair method employed by Dr. MacDonald when he deals with these solemn questions. It need scarcely be remarked that there is not a doctrine of the Protestant creed which cannot be turned into ridicule by this treatment. It is not fairer, nor more dignified, nor more convincing, than the famous mathematical refutation of the doctrine of the trinity: let a , b , c , represent the persons, and x the Godhead; then $a=x$, $b=x$, $c=x$; add, and we have $a+b+c=3x=x$.

Dr. MacDonald displays an equal animosity towards the doctrine of adoption. In one passage he deals with this doctrine in the following terms:

"The gospel you have received is not the gospel of Paul, but one substituted for it by men with hide-bound souls, who, in order to get them into their own in-

¹ *Donal Grant.*

tellectual pockets, melted down the gold of the kingdom and recast it in the moulds of wretched legal thought, learned of the Romans, who crucified their master. Grand, child-like, heavenly things they would explain by vulgar worldly notions of law and right.”¹

This argument is accented and popularized in the following discussion between the straw-champion of orthodoxy and the redoubtable Donal Grant:

“Tell me what is meant by adoption.”

“The taking of children,” said Miss Carmichael, “and treating them as your own.”

“Whose children?” asked Donal.

“Any one’s.”

“Whose, I ask,” repeated Donal, “are the children whom God adopts?”

“The children of Satan,” said Miss Carmichael.

“But if Satan made them how are they to be blamed for doing the deeds of their father?”

“You know very well what I mean. Satan did not make them. God made them, but they have sinned and fallen.”

“Then did God repudiate them?”

“Well, yes.”

“And they became the children of another?”

“Yes, of Satan.”

“Then first God disowns his children, and then, when they are the children of another, makes them his own again by adoption. Is that like a father? Because his children do not please him, he repudiates them altogether till another takes them up, and then he wants them again, not, however, as his own, but as the children of the other, requiring to be adopted to be his. The old relation of their origin has no longer any force, any reality, with their own father! If they were not in the first place, and in the most profound fact, the children of God, they could never become his in that higher sense by any fiction of adoption. . . . Paul preaches no such doctrine. He teaches just what I have been saying. The word is used for adoption, but the original of it is a placing in the position of a son, and he applies it to the raising of one who is a son to the true position of a son.”²

These extracts, and especially the last, illustrate one peculiarity of Dr. MacDonald’s methods. An enthusiastic and eloquent preacher of truth and righteousness, he is as disingenuous in some of his arguments as a Jesuit. His errors are rendered vital by a strong infusion of truth, which makes assimilable a poison otherwise inert. Upon the doctrine of the Abrahamic covenant he is so unjust as to fling this unworthy sarcasm: “Such a legal document constituted the only reliable protection against the character,

¹ *Donal Grant.*

² *Ibid.*

inclinations, and duties of the Almighty, whose uncovenanted mercies are of a very doubtful nature."¹ When he intimates that a defender of the doctrine of eternal punishment can produce from the whole Bible no more convincing proof of that dogma than this, "Where the tree falleth there it shall be," he suppresses the truth with unrighteousness. When he declares that "God will come to ill himself before he will suffer anything that he has made to come to ill,"² he enwraps a heresy in the most sacred folds of the divine compassion.

It follows, as a matter of course, that Dr. MacDonald is a Universalist. Proceeding from the premises which we have already recited, he could not pause short of this conclusion. A hint of his bias toward the restoration theory is given in this brief comment in "Alec Forbes": "It may be suggested that the Church of England herself, in all her beautiful service, has no prayer for the departed soul, which cannot be beyond the need of prayer, as the longings that follow it into the region of the unknown are not beyond its comfort." But he does not confine himself to such tentative suggestions as this. "Robert Falconer" may be said to have been written, in large part, for the express purpose of fostering the delusion which Arch-deacon Farrar has taught us to call "the Eternal Hope." A holy Scotch grandmother, taught from childhood to "chew the bitter cud of ill-cooked theology," after years of prayer for a reprobate son, is silenced from further prayer by the tidings of his death. The most affecting and artful descriptions are given of the conflicts of her soul, tossed back and forth between the doctrine that "it's a' ower wi' a body at their deith," and the loud clamorings of her mother-heart which the dictates of a cruel theology cannot hush. It is not difficult to perceive that the author's deliberate design is to enlist all the sympathies of the reader against the doctrine of the divine justice. He makes one of his most important and most interesting characters distinctly frame the assertion referred to above, namely, that he had never known the defenders of the orthodox doctrine produce any stronger proof of its truth than the words, "Where the tree falleth, there shall it be."³ He declares that in the theological systems of the

¹ *Alec Forbes.*

² *Donal Grant.*

³ *Robert Falconer.*

churches "hell is invariably the deepest truth, and the love of God is not so deep as hell."¹ In still another place he exclaims: "God be praised by those who know religion to be the truth of humanity, its own truth that sets it free, not binds and lops and mutilates it! who see God to be the Father of every human soul, the ideal Father, not an inventor of schemes, or the upholder of a court etiquette, for whose use he has chosen to desecrate the name of *justice*!"² More dogmatically still, he says: "Tell men that the fire of God without and within them will compel them to be-think themselves; that the vision of an open door beyond the smoke and the flames will ever urge them to call up the ice-bound will that it may obey; that the torturing spirit of God in them will keep their consciences awake, not to remind them of what they ought to have done, but to tell them of what they *must* do now; that there is *no* refuge from the compelling love of God—that he is in hell too—and hell will no longer fascinate them."³ And so, when Robert Falconer's efforts for the reclamation of his dissolute and imbruted father are met by the statement that repentance will be of no use in hell, he exclaims: "Father, it *will* be of use in hell. God will give you no rest even there." And then, when the father, jealous from early training for the form of truth at least, replies: "Why, Robert, you don't believe in the Bible," the author breaks in upon the conversation to make these remarks: "His words will be startling to one who has never heard the lips of a hoary sinner drivel out religion. To me they are not so startling as the words of christian women and bishops of the Church of England, when they say that the doctrine of the everlasting happiness of the righteous stands or falls with the doctrine of the hopeless damnation of the wicked."⁴ And as a mere apex to this pyramid of most unsavory teachings, we may add this declaration as to the doctrine of the person of Christ: "Of all the mischievous fictions of theology, the representation that Jesus has two natures is of the falsest."⁵

We fear that these citations will seem to the reader to have been both needlessly and tediously multiplied. We must offer him the assurance that fewer would not have served our purpose.

¹ *Robert Falconer.*

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Donal Grant.*

It is our present endeavor to show that if theology is to be taught in connection with fiction, the fiction should not be deliberately made an ingredient in the theology. We wish to place beyond all question this fact, that, conceding to Dr. MacDonald all the praise that he deserves for the noble thoughts which he has devoted to the establishment and illustration of the truth, it is still doubtful if more pernicious books than these romances of his could fall into the hands of the unwary. His books are of a moral tone almost unexceptionable. They marshal men to their duties and trials in life by the noblest motives and the most inspiring counsels. Yet he denounces the doctrines of adoption and the atonement as pagan corruptions of divine truth. He calls those who preach the dogmas to which he objects "liars against God,"¹ and "serpents of hell."² He casts slurs upon the doctrine of justification by faith, ridicules the Abrahamic covenant, denies the two-fold nature of the Mediator, travesties the Scotch and English Sabbath, justifies prayers for the dead, prophesies the ultimate abolition of hell, and rings all the changes of his contempt on everything that passes for a systematic theology. And all this is done, not in some grave and reverend treatise, as dull as Guicciardini and as ponderous as Mr. Caxton's "History of Human Error," but in books for the multitude, in volumes printed by thousands in the cheapest editions ever bound in paper covers, in stories made readable by the idle and commended to the thoughtful by a style that is often charming, by incidents that are often affecting, and by a philosophy of morals and life that might satisfy the very elect. It is like withdrawing poisons from the care of apothecaries and physicians, and placing them in the hands of children, aye, and making them sweet and palatable. It makes nothing against this argument as addressed to those who revere the articles of faith which Dr. MacDonald assails, that *he* deems those articles to be moral and spiritual poison, and values his own opinions as saving truth. We are stating the aspect of the question from the side of the attacked orthodoxy. We are endeavoring to lead others to believe as we believe, that we have in these widely-read romances a more potent factor than has been thought in the restlessness of

¹ *Donal Grant.*² *Ibid.*

the human mind to-day under the restraints of sound doctrine. Professing christians have sought the counsel of the present writer, and made a confession of dissent from the established creeds, frankly admitting that their departure from former beliefs had dated from the delighted perusal of one or more of George MacDonald's novels. Nor are the means that Dr. MacDonald has adopted for disseminating these errors less effective because they may be denounced as undignified or even contemptible. Where the lightning blasts one tree, the worms destroy a thousand.

Our purpose in this article has been not merely the exhibition of the theological vagaries of Dr. MacDonald, but to contribute the data by which our readers may arrive at an intelligent opinion upon the moral and religious tendencies of his novels. It is therefore with sincere pleasure that we turn from the display of his errors and devote the brief space remaining to us to the presentation of a few of the wise and noble thoughts which are profusely intermingled with statements which we have found so objectionable. These will not reverse our belief that these romances are highly mischievous when they fall into the hands of men and women whose minds are not immovably anchored in the truth. They will serve rather to confirm that belief, because they tend to disguise the first styptic roughness of the revised theology.

What a fine distinction, then, is this between imagining and believing: "To *think* a thing is only to look at it in a glass; to know it as God would have us know it, and as we must know it to live, is to see it as we see love in a friend's eyes; to have it as the love the friend sees in ours. To make things real to us is the end and battle-cause of life. We often think we believe when we are only presenting to our imaginations. The imagination is an endless help towards faith, but it is no more faith than a dream of food will make us strong for the next day's work. To know God as the beginning and end, the root and cause, the giver, the enabler, the love and joy and perfect good, is life. And faith, in its simplest, truest, mightiest form, is to do his will in the one thing revealing itself at the moment as duty."¹ This next is not less impressive: "Peace is for those who *do* the truth, not those who opine it. The true man troubled by intellectual doubt is so trou-

¹ *Donal Grant.*

bled unto further health and growth. Let him be alive and hopeful, above all obedient, and he will be able to wait for the deeper content which must follow with completer insight.”¹ And this, in the same line, is worthy of preservation: “The more a man occupies himself in doing the works of the Father—the sort of things the Father does—the easier will he find it to believe that such a Father is at work in the world.”²

Upon the most judicious ways of reaching and aiding the poor in large cities, Dr. MacDonald speaks with a wisdom which can have been taught only by experience. “I maintain,” says Miss Clare in “The Vicar’s Daughter,” “that you can do nothing for the poor in the way of kindness that shall not result in more harm than good, except you do it from and with genuine charity of soul; with some of that love, in short, which is the heart of religion. Except what is done for them is so done as to draw out their trust and affection, and so raise them consciously in the human scale, it can only tend either to hurt their feelings and generate indignation, or to encourage fawning and beggary. . . . Until we *are* their friends it is worse than useless to pretend to be such, and until they feel that we are their friends it is worse than useless to talk to them about God and religion.” These observations are strikingly parallel with the published views of the Bishop of Bedford, whose diocese includes some of the largest pauper precincts of London, and than whom no man living can speak on this subject with more authority. It was he of whom it was told that when he first took charge of his saddening work the people used to say, “There goes *a* bishop.” Very soon the exclamation grew warmer, “There goes *the* bishop.” The power of love was presently triumphant, and the greeting everywhere met him, “Here comes *our* bishop.”

Here are one or two helpful thoughts on prayer:

“The most precious answer prayer can have lies in the growing strength of the impulse towards the dreaded duty, and in the ever sharper stings of the conscience.”³ “The God to whom we pray is nearer to us than the very prayer itself ere it leaves the heart.”⁴ “What must be the bliss of any heart when it comes to know that there is a Father of fathers, yea, a Father of fatherhood, a Father who never slumbers nor sleeps, but holds all the sleeping in his ever waking bosom?”⁵

¹ Paul Faber, Surgeon. + ² Ibid.

⁴ Paul Faber.

³ Thomas Wingfold, Curate.

⁵ Sir Gibbie.

And is not this Scotch prayer very sweet?

"O thou, wha keeps the stars alicht, an' oor souls burnin' wi' a licht aboon that o' the stars, grant that they may shine afore thee as the stars forever an' ever. An' as thou hauds the stars burnin' a' the nicht, whan there's no man to see, so Laud thou the licht burnin' in oor souls, whan we see neither thee nor it, but are buried in the grave o' sleep. Be thou by us, even as a mither sits by the bedside o' her ailin' wean a' the lang nicht; only be thou nearer to us, even in oor verra souls. Grant that more an' more thochts o' thy thinkin' may come into oor herts day by day, till there shall be at last an open road atween thee an' us, an' we may be in thy heaven, e'en while we are upo' thy earth. Amen."¹

Here is another morsel of Scotch dialect. We find nothing irreverent in the thought or words—much, on the contrary, that is quite exquisite in its pathos:

"We dinna hear 'at the Saviour himsel' ever sae muckle as smiled," said Thomas Crann.

"Weel, that wad hae been little wonner, wi' what he had upo' him. But I'm nae sure that he did na', for a' that; fowk disna aye tell whan a body lauchs. I'm thinkin' gin ane o' the bairnies that he took upo' 's knee, an' he was ill-pleased wi' them 'at wid hae shued them awa', gin ane o' them had hauden up his wee timmer horsie, wi' a broken leg an' had prayed him to work a miracle an' men' the leg, he wadna hae wrocht a miracle, I daur say; but he wad hae smilet, or maybe lauchen a wee, and he wad hae men't the leg some gait or ither to please the bairnie. And gin't had been me, I wad raither hae had the men'in' o' 's ain twa han's wi' a knife to help them, maybe, nor twenty miracles upo't."²

We wish that space permitted us to add many more extracts that have long enriched our scrap-book. We must conclude these citations at this point, and venture to add only the one which follows:

"Death and the breaking shell—in each we behold a birth of which we see but half. We are outside the one, waiting for a life from the unknown; we are inside the other, watching the departure of a spirit from the womb of the world into the unknown. To the region whither he goes, the man enters newly born. We forget that it is a birth and call it a death. The body he leaves behind is but the *placenta* by which he drew his nourishment from his mother earth. And as the child-bed is watched on earth with anxious expectancy, so the couch of the dying, as we call them, may be surrounded by the birth-watchers of the other world, waiting, like anxious servants, to open the door to which this world is but the wind-blown porch."³

¹ *David Elginbrod.*

² *Alec Forbes of Howglen.* Mrs. Margaret J. Preston has published some exquisite verses, entitled, "The Unrecorded Smile," founded on a real incident. These verses enfold in their poetic form the same thought that is so quaintly expressed above.

³ *Robert Falconer.*

Those who have read the second series of "Misread Passages of Holy Scripture," by Baldwin Brown, will be impressed by the similarity between the doctrine of this passage and that which Mr. Brown has so powerfully urged in his fine sermon on the "Overthrow of Death."

These passages and scores of others equally beautiful and impressive may well serve to account for the popularity of these novels. They are not chosen by the utterly frivolous and idle part of the novel-reading public. They are read and admired by men and women who are attracted by their sound morality, charmed by their serious and earnest philosophy, and fascinated by their representations of the universal Fatherhood of God. Many do not perceive the grave doctrinal errors which we have endeavored to exhibit in the earlier part of this article. Many who do perceive them like the books none the less therefor. Many more, who do not sympathize with the errors themselves, are ready with apologies, and urge the splendid sentiments which we have last recorded as a proof that the statements to which we have made objection are not as serious as they seem. We cannot admit the force of this apology. We have shown that these romances are liable to charges from which no beauty of style or sentiment can redeem them. But in the hands of those who know how to discriminate between that which is noxious and that which is helpful, the romances of George MacDonald may prove a mighty agency for spiritual instruction. They abound in teachings as worthy of enthusiastic praise as their frequent bitternesses towards the established forms of truth, and the unfairness with which these bitternesses sometimes speak, are deserving of reprobation. Much that they contain fulfils and justifies the eloquent language of Mr. Shorthouse which we quoted above. They help men to live and struggle and trust and hope. They bring cheer to many that are sorrowful, and uplift men to the belief that "the mists and the storms and the cold will pass; the sun and the sky are forevermore." Dr. MacDonald's pictures of nature are so sunny, his insight into character is so keen, his morality is so lofty, his representations of the love of the Father-God are so inspiring, his views of human destiny under the influences of the gospel are so hopeful, his sympathy with all sorrow and per-

plexity is so tender, and his denunciation of selfishness, dishonesty, bigotry, masculine impurity and feminine coquetry is so scathing, that all who admire the beautiful and love the true and wish for the good will award to him praise which is none the less sincere because it must needs be qualified. Accepting the Master's own test, and judging of roots by their fruits, we are almost compelled to attribute to this tree a double root, the one part sending sap to leaves of truth for the healing of men's sorrows and sins, the other bearing apples of Sodom for their poisoning.

Do the facts, as we have endeavored to display them, demonstrate that romance and religion are ill-matched, and that religion must needs be soiled or romance be spoiled by their conjunction? Do they refute the arguments by which Mr. Shorthouse has sought to prove that philosophy is most persuasive and religion most consolatory when framed in a pure, life-like story? We think not. Who can read that old and almost forgotten novel by Samuel Warren, "Now and Then," and believe that religion must perforce be degraded by its association with fiction? If one could extract from George MacDonald's novels all the offensive slurs which he casts upon the ministry, all the bitter insinuations which he points at the established orthodoxy, all the unsafe and untrue announcements of doctrine, we should be inclined to count his romances among the most attractive, the most helpful, the most effective for spiritual teaching, that we have seen. That his views should be so unsatisfactory, and that he should press them so obtrusively upon the acceptance of his readers, will always be a source of unmixed regret to those who find in his writings so much that they can both admire and love.

If we may venture to attach to this imperfect essay so dignified a conclusion, we will quote these closing lines of "The Seaboard Parish":

"I must now take leave of my patient reader, for surely every one who has followed me through all that I have written well deserves the epithet, bidding him farewell with one word, '*Friend, hope thou in God,*' and for a parting gift offering him a new, and, I think, a true rendering of the first verse of the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews:

"Now faith is the essence of hopes, the trying of things unseen."

"Good-bye."

JAMES HENDERSON SMITH.

Lexington, Va.

VII. NOTES.

EVANGELISM, AGAIN.

WITHIN the bosom of the American Presbyterian Church, as within the womb of Rebekah, "two manner of people" have struggled together from the very beginning. And the difference between them is very analogous to that which the Scriptures indicate between the two sons of Isaac; Jacob being "a plain man dwelling in tents," while Esau was "a cunning hunter, a man of the field." The spirit of the one has been conservative, that of the other progressive. The habits of the one have been pastoral, of the other evangelistic. The one have been intent on "strengthening the stakes," the other on "lengthening the cords." The one have aimed primarily at the preservation of the truth, the other at the propagation of it. It is interesting to notice how the divisions that have marred the history of our church have almost invariably had their origin in this difference. The first disruption, that of 1741, was solely upon this issue. "It was not the result," says Dr. Hodge, "of conflicting views either as to doctrine or church government. It was the result of alienation of feeling produced by the controversies relating to the great revival." The New Brunswick brethren, fired with evangelistic zeal, were in full sympathy with that movement, and were ardent promoters of it. They saw nothing to fear in its attendant disorders, inclining rather to regard them as tokens of God's presence. On the other hand, the Philadelphia brethren were possessed by a spirit of conservatism; they were zealous for the maintenance of decency and order, and nervously afraid of a zeal not according to knowledge. The result was that the two could not walk together because they were not agreed, and the church, even thus early in her history, became two bands. The division of 1810, which led to the formation of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, had, as all understand, a similar origin. And, even in that of 1837, along with the serious doctrinal differences which existed, and, in some measure at least, accounting for them, was the very antagonism of which we now speak.

This same struggle is going on in the bosom of our own church today. Conclusive evidence of this is seen in the earnest discussions that have marked these later years on such subjects as the aggressiveness

of Presbyterianism, the standard of education required for ordination to the ministry, modern evangelism, revivals, etc.

Again, it has been true in the history of the church, as in the family of Isaac, that the one people have been stronger than the other, and the elder has served the younger. The man of the tent has supplanted the man of the field, and held the birthright. The evangelist, who stands first in the list of Christ's ascension gifts, has been completely subordinated to the pastor. The church has said, with an emphasis not to be mistaken, "Pastors have I loved, evangelists have I hated." She has held the pastor in honor and magnified his office, while she has looked upon the evangelist with suspicion. The inevitable result has been that her ministers have been almost exclusively pastors, and pastors all of their time.

It is needless to say that we are far from any disposition to depreciate the pastorate, or to take sides against our own church in the struggles of the past. But a calm review of our history does suggest irresistibly that the victory of conservatism has been too complete. There has been too little concession to the aggressive or evangelistic spirit. It has not been allowed the scope which has been provided for it in our Constitution and in the New Testament, and which is imperatively demanded in a country so largely unevangelized as ours. Under the old covenant there was room only for Jacob. Esau was excluded by a divine decree. But in the christian church there is room for both the shepherd and the cunning hunter, the pastor and the evangelist. Both are gifts from our glorified Lord; both are necessary for the edifying of his body; and the church will only realize her designed efficiency when she freely employs both, and allows neither to encroach upon or supplant the other. Her mission is not only to preserve the truth in its purity, but also to propagate it. She has been set not more for defence than for conquest; and she can accomplish this two-fold mission only when equipped with the two-fold ministry which her Lord has appointed.

There are few things which a review of our church's history teaches more impressively than the necessity of modifying the practical working of our system along this line, and of bringing it into more perfect harmony with apostolic methods. Dr. Wilson well says in his admirable paper before the Council in Philadelphia: "As things are, we have one variety of the preaching office; we require another. We have the rooted ministry; let this be supplemented by a branching ministry. We have our fixed batteries; we need to have also our flying

artillery. We have many whose duty and whose joy it is to *stand* for Christ in set places, and at given times; we ought to have quite as many whose duty and whose joy it shall be to *run* for Christ into all places, and at all times." Would that the whole church were fully aroused to an appreciation of this defect, and would seriously and earnestly undertake the task of remedying it! May we venture a few simple suggestions looking to this end?

1. Let each minister of the word "make full proof of his ministry," by "*doing the work of an evangelist*." (2 Tim. iv. 5.) The fact that he is a pastor or teacher must not exempt him, as it did not exempt Timothy, from "evangelizing." He must, at times, leave the ninety and nine and go out after the lost and wandering.

2. Let churches be taught that they have not done their whole duty when they have supplied themselves, and their own immediate communities, with religious privileges, but that it is incumbent on them to send gospel messengers to the regions beyond. Let them be made to see how selfish and unlike Christ it is to lay an exclusive claim upon the services of their pastors, and that by sharing these good gifts of God with others who are destitute, they fulfil the law of Christ, and obtain for themselves the promise: "He that watereth shall be watered also himself."

3. Let Presbyteries consider evangelists a permanent and essential part of their equipment, and let such be esteemed "very highly in love for their work's sake." A Presbytery should not hesitate, as we think, to lay the hand of authority upon its best men, however great the demand for them as pastors, and set them apart, for a time at least, as travelling heralds. The Holy Ghost bade the Presbytery at Antioch do this very thing, and, while no doubt they were reluctant to spare Barnabas and Saul from their number, they obeyed the heavenly vision and were well repaid for the sacrifice. There are men whose light the church cannot afford to have hidden within the bounds of a single congregation.

4. Let the church secure for her candidates such training as will inspire them with the spirit of evangelism, develop their evangelistic gifts, and acquaint them with apostolic methods of evangelizing. A writer in the April number of this review suggested the founding of lectureships on evangelism, in connection with our theological seminaries. The main purpose of this "Note" is to emphasize and express sympathy with this suggestion. Something of this nature would, we are persuaded, do much towards promoting the efficiency of

our ministry, and giving to the church more of the character of a "missionary body." Our young men are instructed in *pastoral* theology, and no church can show more efficient pastors; we need to have them instructed, likewise, in *evangelistic* theology. They should be trained not only to be shepherds, but cunning hunters after souls; not only to feed a flock, but to gather one. In a word, they should sit under the full instruction of him who said, not only, "Feed my sheep," but also, and previously, "Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men;" and through him to be taught how to cast the gospel net so as to enclose a great multitude of souls.

Let the Presbyterian Church equip herself with this two-fold ministry which Christ has provided—the one missionary, the other stationary; the one for gathering, the other for shepherding—and, with God's blessing, the glory of her future may even eclipse the glory of her past. Longfellow was asked towards the close of his life how it was that he had succeeded in retaining so much of the freshness and vigor of youth down to an extreme old age. He replied by pointing to an oak on the lawn, which, although it had breasted the storms of a hundred winters, was covered with as fresh and green foliage as any of its younger rivals. "The secret of that oak's vigor," said he, "is the secret of mine. Like it, I am continually making new wood, so that much of me is still young." The same law holds in a church's life. If our good old Presbyterian tree is to remain "fat and flourishing," during this next century of her organized life, "still bringing forth fruit in old age," she must be constantly *making new wood*, achieving fresh conquests, and assimilating new material; and in order to this she must make use of the branching ministry; she must "do the work of an evangelist."

J. F. CANNON.

SCOTTISH-VIRGINIA PRESBYTERIANISM.

IN this centennial year of Presbyterianism in the United States, inquiries will be in order as to what this phase of doctrine has accomplished in the past, and what tendency its distinctive principles may be expected to have in conserving and perpetuating civil and religious liberty. The undersigned would hereby attempt a contribution to centennial literature by brief notes on Scottish-Virginia Presbyterianism.

The history of the Scotch-Irish people who colonized important sec-

tions of the great Virginia Valley is essential to a proper appreciation of the causes resulting in the contest for American independence. Though these colonists enjoyed privileges as favored subjects of British rule, and were so far removed from the commercial and social centres of the colonies as to be the very last to suffer from the practical evils of oppression, yet they were the first to prepare papers proposing a separation from the government of Great Britain.

In January and February, 1775, the citizens of Augusta and Boteourt Counties, Virginia, held meetings and appointed committees to frame resolutions setting forth their views and wishes. On one of such committees was Rev. Charles Cummins, a Presbyterian minister. From the reports of these committees that were adopted and formally presented to the Continental Congress and the Colony Convention of Virginia, at Richmond, the same year, the following extracts are given:

"We are heartily grieved at the differences which now subsist between the parent State and the Colonies, and most ardently wish to see harmony restored on an equitable basis and by the most lenient measures that can be devised by the heart of man.

"Many of us and our forefathers left our native land, considering it as a kingdom subjected to inordinate power and greatly abridged of its liberties. We crossed the Atlantic and explored this then uncultivated wilderness, bordering on many savage nations and surrounded by mountains almost inaccessible to any but those very savages, who have been incessantly committing barbarities and depredations on us since our first seating the country. These fatigues and dangers we patiently encountered, supported by the pleasing hope of enjoying those rights and liberties which had been granted to Virginia, but denied us in our native country. We by no means desire to shake off our duty or allegiance to our lawful sovereign, but, on the contrary, shall ever glory in being the loyal subjects of a Protestant prince, descended from such illustrious progenitors, so long as we can enjoy the free exercise of our religion as Protestants and our liberties and properties as British subjects. But if no pacific measures shall be adopted by Great Britain, and our enemies will attempt to dragoon us out of those inestimable principles which we are entitled to as subjects and to reduce us to slavery, we **DECLARE** that we are deliberately and resolutely determined never to surrender them to any power upon earth but at the expense of our lives."

From a paper sent by the freeholders of Augusta County, Virginia, to the Colony Convention at Richmond, March 20, 1775, the following is given, showing the temper of this Presbyterian people:

"Placing our ultimate trust on the Supreme Disposer of every event, without whose gracious interposition the wisest scheme may fail of success, we desire to move the convention that some day, which may appear to them most convenient, be set apart for imploring the blessing of Almighty God on such plans as human wisdom and integrity may think necessary to adopt for preserving America happy,

virtuous and free. We are too sensible of the inestimable privileges enjoyed by subjects under the British constitution even to wish for a change, while free enjoyment of these blessings can be secured to us; but, on the other hand, can justly boast of our loyalty and affection to our most gracious Sovereign and of our readiness in risking our lives whenever it was found necessary for the defence of his person and government. But should a wicked and tyrannical ministry, under the sanction of a corrupt and venial Parliament, persist in acts of injustice and violence towards us, they only must be answerable for the consequences. Liberty is so strongly impressed upon our hearts that we cannot think of parting with it, but our duty to God, our country, and our posterity all forbid it. We therefore stand prepared for every contingency."

The documents from which these articles are given antedate, by several months, the famous "Mecklenburg Declaration," yet they have no place in any formal, elaborate history of our country; nor has there been any special importance attached to them by the whimsical muse of our American annals.

The more one studies the history of the Scottish-Virginia Presbyterians, the more firmly is the impression fixed that *principle*, not *blind impulse*, was the ruling factor in their actions. The more isolated, the more unsustained they were by reason of their local characteristics, the more were they resolved to respect themselves and keep the laws given by God, and approved of by the men pure in heart. If the lessons taught by such a history be properly heeded, their tendency would be to develop true courage, the noblest type of manliness, imperishable love of liberty, and undying adherence to principle.

It is interesting to notice in some one of the papers adopted by the Scotch-Irish patriots the intimation that they would have moved even sooner had it not been for troubles with the Indians. This is very significant, for it leads to the inference that had they failed in their Indian campaigns, these preliminary steps to a war for independence would have been deferred indefinitely, and possibly for all time. The Indian power was broken at Point Pleasant in October, 1774, only a few months before the memorable January and February meetings that framed the papers already alluded to. All this gives peculiar distinction to that Scotch-Irish battle that attaches to a pivotal point in human destiny, and one, too, that leaves an impress upon the welfare of the whole human race.¹

¹ It is conceded that when the Indians were assailed in flank and rear, the battle of Point Pleasant was decided in favor of the Virginians.

There is every reason, moreover, to believe that had this not been done the army would have been annihilated, and untold disasters would have desolated the

If it can be thus demonstrated that the world is largely indebted to Presbyterians, and especially the Virginia Scotch-Irish, for the blessings of the Republic, it does seem it ought to do much towards preparing the way for a favorable consideration of their doctrines and ecclesiastical polity, on the part of all patriotic and truly christian people.

It would thus appear, too, that data for such a demonstration should be diligently collected and most carefully preserved. Moreover, there is no history more interesting than this in the bearing it has upon the history of our own times. It deals with events that are exponents of great ideas and currents of useful thought. These ideas are mostly ethical and religious, and have a bearing more or less direct upon the relations between christianity and the citizens of our country. The historical question is becoming more and more prominent, What have the principles of the christian religion done? What are the same doing now towards purifying, consolidating and perpetuating the Republic? Any sect that expects to stay in this land can find no practical subject more vitally interesting than the study of such an inquiry, and acting accordingly. For there are questions now pending whose decision involves the most precious interests of our common humanity, which cannot be intelligently discussed without an intimate acquaintance with this very history. At this moment there are two conspicuous rival phases of ecclesiastical polity striving for the ascendancy in our

Valley of Virginia; the war of Independence would have been deferred indefinitely, and the whole history of America would have been far different.

Mr. Jacob Warwick, an obscure private in the ranks, had been detailed, with fifty or sixty others, to secure a supply of meat, that rations might be prepared for a hasty march to the Indian towns, in obedience to Governor Dunmore's treacherous orders. When the firing was heard by the hunters and butchers there were various surmises. Some thought it was a salute to Governor Dunmore; others thought it was the troops preparing their guns; finally, Jacob Warwick suspected it was a battle. Upon being assured such was the fact, he took measures at once to rally the hunters and butchers, crossed over, and opened fire on the enemy's flank. This was seen and heard by the Virginians, and they supposed Colonel Christian was coming up with the reserves, and under that impression two or three companies were dispatched to open communication and sustain the onset. From that moment the enemy began to retreat, and victory was assured the imperilled troops.

The humble man whose hand was used in turning the fortunes of that eventful day sleeps in his obscure grave, six miles west of the Warm Springs, Va. One sees in this how most important results depend upon fidelity to duty on the part of the most obscure, and emphasizes the guiding of God's hand in the revolution, seemingly one of the most important struggles in its consequences that has ever occurred.

country. All history goes to show that whatever theory of ecclesiastical polity may be adopted by the mass of the people, it becomes in due time the civil government of that people; hence the great importance to be attached to the church polity likely to become predominant in the religion of a nation.

The adherents of these rival systems clamor for religious liberty and vie in their devotion to civil rights. Yet the *principle* in which they have originated seems to be studiously ignored, and the whole controversy appears to most as a mere war of words about methods, to be accepted or rejected by applying the maxims of expediency. It is believed by most, if not all, that the adherents of each have at heart the good of the country, but merely differ as to what are the most expedient measures of attaining their cherished aims.

In the English mind it is a fixed principle that organism, with or without different grades of officers, is essential to the proper development of religious institutions; hence the yearning for a great, all-absorbing corporation to establish ordinances and to enjoy them unawed and undisturbed by any rival corporation. Such must be virtually everything or nothing before matters in the church assume a satisfactory form. In this English phase, the member is for the church, not the church for the member.

The Scottish-Virginia theory places the *individual* above the *corporation*; hence it accords to the individual the responsibility of choosing for himself, untrammelled by corporate influences, his doctrines of belief and forms of worship; and this choice, too, not to be disputed or disturbed as a matter between him and God, and in no wise to be called into question by men in a corporate capacity. In brief, the Scottish-Virginia phase of ecclesiastical polity, regards the church as existing for the member, and not the member for the church.

There was an apparent attempt to resuscitate the Scottish-Virginia theory in May, 1875, at Charlotte, N. C., but the outgivings are so uncertain in their sound that one fears the speakers and reporters did not rise to the height of the great argument assigned them, and did not effectively vindicate the views and methods of the Scotch-Irish. Perhaps, if we could have seen and heard for ourselves, our impressions might have been quite different. As it now appears to us, the whole modern question seems to be one of mere priority and of more expedient measures. The partisans of the Puritan and the cavalier, and the friends of the Scotch-Irish, as a general thing, rest mainly on questions of chronology in their rivalry for precedence in the national

heart. This ancient dust has been so copiously and effectively thrown into our eyes, that now there are persons in fullest possession of the heart and confidence of the church founded by the Scotch-Irish, that are no more nor less than learned, eloquent and most logical Presbyterians, with extreme corporate views and methods. With such, to all intents and purposes, the member is for the church, not the church for the member. The practical working may be thus briefly presented: those who hold high corporate views and act consistently give their attention mainly to elaborating their ideas of a perfect church organism, and their aim is to attract such materials among the unsaved as may best serve the purposes of the church as constructed by them.

The tendency of the pure Scottish-Virginia theory is just the reverse in its workings. It leads its consistent adherents to make the actual needs of men in a given community, or a particular era, the subject of earnest and prayerful investigation; and the church's mission is to devise the ways and means most approved to reach and meet these needs with the saving power of the gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

The outcome of these rival phases of church polity has been controversy all along the lines from the previous century until now. All available materials that serve to illustrate the origin and progress of historic controversies should be most carefully gathered up and considered, so as to enable us to understand questions pertaining to our present duty in the eventful times now upon us. For example, let the lesson be considered which is to be learned from the controversy carried on by the Old and New sides. While it was pending, population gained on the church. When it subsided, and ministers and people gave themselves to prayer and the ministry of the word, the church gained on the population.

This aptitude for controversy owes its origin to the conflicting theories of rigid organism on the one hand, and the flexibly wise adaptation of unchanging principles to *changing circumstances* on the other. The influence of the former of these theories is very perceptible in much that is spoken and written pertaining to the *limits* of theological belief. It declares the sum of essential, saving knowledge is complete, no place for expansion or development. It is not orderly or safe to attempt anything in the way of work or regulation unless there be *precedent* or *authority*. According to the latter theory, which is the one implied in the Scottish-Virginia view of practical church work, the *sum* of saving doctrines is *complete*. The truths of morals and religion

are *few* and *all known*; but there is no limit to their apprehension and application. For illustration, no advance in mental power or scientific discovery will add to the statement that six and six are twelve. In some directions progress is at an end. In morals emphatically it is so. In morals the limits of all progress and higher attainment were reached by the unequalled mind of our Teacher, the Lord Jesus Christ.

In music no one can ever add a ninth note to the scale; yet in every generation gifted composers can find noblest scope for their tuneful powers in combining the eight notes in new relations to each other, resulting in sweeter songs and more touching melodies than ever heard by previous lovers of music. So in morals and theology, principles and doctrines are known and numbered; yet there is ample scope for the genius of Scottish-Virginianism to arrange, combine and apply to the needs of fallen humanity, and thus present the blessings of religion as fresh and pure as the dawn of each new day, to the praise and glory of God's amazing grace.

We are making history, whether we will it or not. But it is in our power to modify the character of this history and have its verdict, favorable or unfavorable, to our memory. Historic research will be turned upon us in coming years and a decision reached, and this record will be referred to for examples of imitation or warning: just as the history may be that we are making.

The statistics of the past decade, so much relied upon as indicating the tendencies of the history we are making, indicate that one of the needs of the present is a general and mighty revival of pure and undefiled religion. The gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that BELIEVES, and there should be no doubt of its final success; hence vain regrets and despondent, formal services are not the way to meet the duties of the eventful present. Neither is it a time for self-complacency in merely holding our own in christian effort.

Historical research shows that professionalism, literary pride, and love of the honors that are awarded by men on the part of the "Angels of the Churches," and worldliness, self-indulgence, and love of money among the members, were the bane of the apostolic churches and the source of their weakness.

Now, may it not be a pertinent inquiry for us to consider whether the historian of the future, whose province it will be to review the history we are making, shall draw similar inferences in reference to us and our people?

During this centennial year may there be very many whose plea-

sure it will be to walk about Zion and go round about her, telling the towers thereof, and duly heeding these words of the Psalmist, who tells us from his regal throne that he would rather be a doorkeeper in the courts of the Lord's house: "Mark ye well her bulwarks, consider her palaces, that ye may tell it to the generations following." And may we all who live in times so momentous desire a double portion of the spirit manifested by an ancient worthy under stress of emergencies: "Be of good courage, and let us play the men for our people, and for the cities of our God; and the Lord do that which seemeth him good." (2 Sam. x. 12.)

WILLIAM T. PRICE.

PROF. DRUMMOND'S APOLOGY TO SCIENTISTS.

PROF. DRUMMOND'S still widely popular book, "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," is an effort of classification, in which he attempts to place the whole department of religious thought and fact under the control of natural law, to relieve it of the damaging effect of being considered the "Great Exception." This term he leaves entirely open to any exposition the reader may choose, and therefore for whatever amount of dubiety on the whole subject of religion it may contain, his book must be held responsible.

His last chapter is, itself, on the topic of "Classification." But he is there only grouping the entities of the third or spiritual kingdom into a class under the laws of biology and embryology; in which he accuses theologians of following too closely the old law of morphology in classifying beings in the spiritual kingdom. Should they learn to test spiritual cases by the new laws of biology, etc., he thinks it would be a material improvement in theological inquiry. But biology and embryology are tests almost too recondite even for scientists to discriminate in a region where incipient protoplasm may become anything in subsequent development. How much more difficult in that spiritual department of being where the embryonic existence is infinitely more occult!

The book is chiefly an apology to scientists for a crude theology, and seemingly an effort to conciliate them to religion; but the effort results in making science dominate the universe.

Let us say, before we go farther, that we repudiate the whole doctrine of apologetics for religion. It contains seminally an admission of

defect in the department of religious thought that damages the whole subject. It implicitly concedes that an innate suspicion hangs to the matter of direct communications between God and men, and that only that knowledge is originally well founded which is reducible to the domain of natural law.

If apologists commiserate only our arrangement and interpretation of spiritual things, we will thank every apologist for his pains. But if the matter itself, arranged and codified, is to be implicitly impeached as well as its imperfect presentation, and then presented to science to sit in judgment upon its title to credibility, we utterly decline a policy both degrading and suicidal.

An apology for religion is the first step taken towards accepting the infamous proposition of Nahash the Ammonite, to pluck out the right eye of every valiant man of Israel as a condition to peace negotiations.

Professor Drummond's book is fascinating and popular, and something might be said in praise of its pretty and sometimes instructive analogies, but for that far more serious fascination, which, like a "will o' the wisp," holds the imagination of the reader suspended between a *fading theology* and a *new light* dawning from the depths of nature and pointed out by science. The writer, as a professor of religion, honors various notable dicta in the Bible, and expounds them as the highest eliminations of science and of natural law. But there can be no doubt as to the scope of his argument from the Scriptures. It is meant to show the grand superiority of natural law and of science, its interpreter, over all religious law and over theology, as its interpreter. It places theology in a pitiable condition, and introduces to the reader a world of skepticism as to the validity of all religious opinions. It is this, not its rhetorical beauties, that gives it fascination to the modern mind. The ostensible position and scope of the book is that it means to portray the comparative inferiority of theological to scientific methods, leaving untouched the real substance of religion. But who can say, after reading the following sentences (Introduction, page 30, Pott & Co., N. Y.), that he does not leave the whole subject of religion somewhat violently untouched, and that the language does not treat the department of revealed religion, because hitherto so poorly organized by theologians, with commiseration? Endorsing the sentiment of Herbert Spencer, that "there is an innermost core of skepticism" in all religionists, which makes them "dread inquiry when brought face to face with scientists," he adds: "What, then, has science done to make theology tremble? It is its whole system, which, when compared

and weighed with the other, is found wanting. An eye which has looked upon the first cannot look upon this. To do that and rest in the contemplation, it has first to uncentury itself." It is true, indeed, that in the above sentences he is speaking of methods and arrangement; but if he had really meant imperfect methods only, he would have accepted the golden truths which they covered and brought them to light. The "system" and methods merely could not essentially damage the facts. What science wants and claims to have is *fact*. That the animus of these quotations is an affected contempt for *any* theology not subordinated to natural science, is evident from the attempt to throw over the whole of modern theology the crudeness and ignorance belonging to antiquity, by saying that the scientific eye that looks upon it and approves must "uncentury itself." If the centuries have nothing more to do with scientific facts, long ago given in nature, than to find them out and methodize them, why should he "uncentury" himself by going back eighteen hundred years to find an old and crude *form* of truth in the Scriptures, and, by his exposition of it, find a germ of biology and arrange it under the laws of modern science?

He mentions the fact that "the younger and abler minds of this age find the most serious difficulty in accepting and retaining the ordinary forms of belief." He attributes this difficulty to the *forms*. But this is by no means the cause. Who has ever yet been led to accept or retain the doctrine of election or of total depravity by couching them in any other terms which did not change the substance of the doctrine itself? What is it, we may ask, that is the matter of distaste to the younger and abler minds of this age? the doctrines or the forms in which they are expressed? Why is the plain historical fact ignored, that through all the ages, the doctrines and precepts of christianity have been with great difficulty "received and retained"? Even that small portion of our race that has, with great pains, been indoctrinated from childhood into the principles of christianity has been, in the old time, and is still in this age, a "stiff-necked and rebellious people." The very best christians, and every one of them, have in each individual case "received" them with the utmost reluctance, as their conversion experience proves, and every one of them has found that it required a struggle through life to "retain" them. Who among men readily submits to the humiliating terms of christian doctrine? Of what value would be a change of the forms of belief "if their humiliating quality is retained?" The proposition, therefore, to change the creeds into milder or more scientific forms, to make them popular and

to "century" them, is a distinct purpose to divest them of their spiritual severity, and so far, of their spiritual and real existence; and in divesting them of their severity destroy their disciplinary power in making men masters of themselves. Science does not propose to educate the moral forces, and should not propose such a modification of them as would make them inert in effecting any radical change in the character of the "younger and abler minds of this age."

The true adherents of christianity have always been a "little flock," not because the "forms of belief" are antiquated and unscientific, but for two potent reasons which will continue to the end of time. The one is, that man is, natively and under all stages of civilization, averse to the doctrine of the cross. The other is, that the doctrines and precepts of christianity propose to raise men to the highest moral culture, through the agency of the severest discipline that their nature can bear. This is the reason why the "younger and abler minds" of this century receive christianity with difficulty. This is the reason why the old demand for new and popular forms of belief, through all the ages, is now reiterated with scientific sanction.

It is meant by this modern demand that the creed of to-day rests upon a *traditional* basis: that having become interwoven with our feelings of veneration for the past, it is a species of religious patrimony which we give up with reluctance, and that our advanced modern thought demands that it be formulated anew, and formulated anew by trimming and expurgating its antiquated ideas, especially every dogmatic element which antagonizes the rational methods of science; but the plan of reform which proposes to improve by expunging integral elements is both unscientific and unhistorical. Science itself has always advanced by integrations, not disintegrations of facts. Evolution takes the opposite course to simplifications and reductions of forms. It cumulates them. If from the cumulations and variations a condensed principle is evolved, that condensed generalization can only be understood and appreciated as it rests upon the cumulations of fact. Old types are always conserved, and where discoveries have been made they are accretions to the growing creed of the scientist. Theology follows this historical law of growth. Her doctrinal formulas are a growth of the ages, most carefully, most critically, most logically stated, as each age might demand a new test of erratic opinion.

In every instance of re-statement, the history of creeds will warrant the assertion that some new elements have been added to the elaborateness of the structure or to complete the logic of the argument. It

is the *natural history* of all respectable creeds that they never go backwards by reduction to simpler forms. Though there are many of them differentiated by their respective peculiarities, two things are remarkable; they have a substantial unity in the elements which compose them, and they constantly gravitate towards each other. It is alleged that their variations are due to contradictory opinions, and that they tend to disintegration. It is a crude and ill-formed judgment. They are concentric, and look to a manifested and realized unity. The evangelical creed of to-day is more and more the effect of a slow and inevitable sedimentation of christian thought, and that even under the operation of discussion sprung from diverse denominational opinions. The very creeds to which Prof. Drummond objects as dissonant and contradictory are the agencies of discussion evolving a consolidated theology, no less built on original facts and principles given than the slow findings of science are built upon the original data of nature. Some trimming, but more growth, is the law of creeds that have any foundation at all. The constant tendency, and the natural tendency, is to make creeds more elaborate as the only possible condition of progress. The popular demand, now intensified by scientists, is a fight against a department of thought known by its moral severity, from which they expect to escape under the plea of greater simplicity and wider generalizations, which would allow them the liberty of every variety of belief. The sons of science perpetually emphasize the fact that none but those who have entered into the arcana of scientific investigation can properly estimate her impregnable position. We grant it, and claim, with no less emphasis, that none but those who have entered the exhaustless regions of theological lore can duly appreciate her impregnable foundations.

We write to caution the unwary reader. Certain singular terms are frequently met in Prof. Drummond's book, which, without any proper explanation of their meaning or use, throw an injurious suspicion over the whole subject of religion. The terms are "authority" and "the great exception." Thus (page 10, Preface): "The doctrines" of science, "grounded in nature are so certain that the truths of religion, resting, to most men, on authority, are felt to be strangely insecure." Again: "Those who have learned to look upon law as authority grow cold towards it" (*i. e.*, theology). "It was the great exception." The assumption is that the authority of law antagonizes any authority which may be counted an exception to the continuity of nature. Revelation direct from heaven is such an exception. Therefore a revelation from heaven must take the place of suspicion which every

exception occupies. The writer does not tell us whether he is speaking of the authority of tradition, or of the dogmatics of theologians or of the divine Speaker. He leaves the term there unexplained, dimly shadowing mischievous suspicion, yet covering his retreat if he is attacked. If it be inquired whether he means the authority of a divine Speaker, he could easily answer that he means the authority of theologians. But this will not suffice. He cannot antagonize the authority of theologians and the authority of law without antagonizing the authority of scientists and the authority of law; for both scientists and theologians are reputed *interpreters* of law. He must antagonize the interpretations, *i. e.*, science and theology. But as authority is not vested in interpretations, but in the thing interpreted, he must acknowledge that his term "authority of law" stands opposed to the authority of a direct revelation.

It can, therefore, be easily understood how, in his chapters on Biology, Growth, Death, etc., he interprets certain Scripture quotations as in beautiful conformity with natural law. "This is life eternal," said Christ, "to know thee, the only true God." "To know God is to correspond with perfect environment." "Uninterrupted correspondence with perfect environment is eternal life according to science."

We take no exception to this collation of Scripture and science farther than to say that "uninterrupted correspondence," etc., is an immense and distant possibility, which it is not the office of science, which rests on facts, at present to avow, and which, if it ever comes to exist in the long future, would contradict the very conception of the eternal law of evolution. But we present the above text and interpretation to show that the writer does not use the dictum of Christ as in any other sense authoritative than as a dictum of science and subordinate to natural law; *i. e.*, Scripture has just as much authority to speak as science may find to be conformable to natural law. If the author had not just before antagonized the authority of natural law and all other authority, this exposition might be taken as a pretty analogy, but the principles enounced in his Introduction interpret it as more than an analogy. The dominant authority in the universe is natural law; and as law is nothing but uniformity of sequence in nature, nothing in Scripture which is not reducible to that uniformity can be admitted as authority.

The term, "the great exception," which the author frequently employs without explaining, can only be understood by the reader, from the general trend of the argument, as *something* which contradicts the law of continuity, *i. e.*, natural law, and occupies the position of an ex-

ception, which, though not yet reduced, is *reducible* to the domain of that law. So long as it remains unreduced it is liable to all the doubt which must hang around every unexplained phenomenon. In virtue of its being an exception, it is invested with something more than doubt. As long as it remains unexplained it imposes on the wonder and credulity of mankind and retards the intellectual improvement of the race. The author leaves us to assume that he does not believe "the great exception" to be a real exception, because his book is an attempt to show that no such exception exists. But the showing is weaker than the implication of the term, because, while he ostensibly means that theologians make theology the "great exception," the unexplained term requires that all in and about religion which contravenes natural law must lie under the doubt resting upon all exceptions.

Had the author designated what particular parts or elements in theology he considered exceptions, it would have relieved him from the suspicion of making the whole of it an exception. But when he comprehends, apparently, in one general term the whole department of religion,—both religion, the substance, and theology, the interpretation,—he casts around the horizon of the youthful reader many a glance of skeptical tendency, uncorrected, which should not be found in a book purporting to defend, or, at least, to support religion; for the book, at its very best, is an effort to support a crazy structure by supplementing new props, if not foundations.

But let us take the term, "the great exception," as meaning the miraculous element, the element which is not at present reducible to natural law. From its comprehensiveness, could the author accept any thing in religion not reducible to natural law as an element? Is it possible, on these terms, to accept any miraculous element at all? Would a case of divine interposition ever have been possible under the *role* of that law? The author admits divine interposition in the impartation of life physical, and so of life spiritual. He admits it, on the principle of the theist, everywhere. But by the very argument he employs to show the identity of law in the origin of natural and spiritual life, he divests it of palpability. How very much is science indebted to palpable phenomena! How very large a tracery of investigations and deductions in science has been drawn from abrupt and startling events! from eclipses, astronomical epiphanies, terrestrial anomalies! If the great Author of nature thought it meet to wake up human thought and promote human improvement by startling phenomena and seeming exceptions to settled law, in the department of human learn-

ing, is it antecedently improbable that he would wake up religious thought by palpable and impressive exceptions in a department of thought still more occult, yet of vast importance to man's well-being? With man's inveterate proclivity away from the abstract and difficult things of the spiritual sphere, how indispensable the palpable event, the impressive exception to fasten religious conviction! What a magnificent and powerful sanction to religious thought is the doctrine of the miraculous creation of the world, *i. e.*, of the present æon and its furniture! Where would any religion be found to-day on earth, if the inveterate drift of human thought in all the ages towards a religious agnosticism had not been arrested by some awakening notifications of the presence of God?

It is a very plausible and very pretty substitute for the piety which is fed by miracle to enshrine deity in the archives of nature and give him a ubiquity in natural law; a theory which proposes to bring us into immediate and adoring contact with a God working wonders around us every moment. But while it enthrones him as the symbol of natural law and universal agency, it denies to him the power of breaking the charm of awful continuity in which he has enwrapt himself. It is a theory which comminutes all the great creative acts into thousands of little creations taking place around us.

But in what regard does science propose to us a new ubiquity? It is on the terms of expunging from our theology the only palpable and reliable evidence that the world has of any ubiquitous God at all. If God had never broken the silence of nature after he had set it upon its wheels, by what arguments would it ever have been possible to demonstrate his existence? Would the argument of design and final causes avail? What could be meant by final causes in a catenation of events conditioned upon imperturbable sequences and all of them impregnated with their own spontaneous force? Would conscience afford an argument? How could conscience come to the conception of a being whom nothing in nature or time could suggest as being anything different from the events of nature and time—the falling shower and the illuminating sun? “The heavens declare the glory of God,” but not until something has brought to the human mind the conception of God. Were this conception innate, without the education of awakening experiences, it must eventually be lost, buried beneath the clamoring claims of a struggling life; for conscience ratifies or condemns just what the mind has and no more. It finds nothing. It judges only.

We wish here to say, that so far as the term “great exception” implies the miraculous element in religion as an unexplained phenomenon,

which, on scientific principles, cannot be believed until it finds its place under the domain of natural law, it carries an assumption against all religion. Without the miracle no religion can exist. It is fundamental to the very conception of that subject, that it is a personal communication between God and man, and we cannot conceive of any intelligent communication with a being who is outside of our sphere of being without transcending the limits of nature. Any amount of critical and learned lore is invited to examine the trustworthiness of a thing which has been so much imitated as the miracle. But no amount of human lore can divest religion, as a subject, of its most essential element, the miracle. Actual miracles have ceased. Recorded miracles remain. Without the recorded miracle adequately attested, it could never be demonstrated to the present generation, or to any generation, that God ever existed.

D. E. FRIERSON.

Anderson, S. C.

NOTE.—THE SOUTHERN GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

The statement in my article on the late Southern General Assembly in Baltimore, that Dr. H. M. Smith, of New Orleans, offered his resolution on the Reunion Question on Thursday, May 17th, is obviously incorrect. He offered at that time a resolution "to fix an order of the day for Friday . . . to consider the report of the Committee of Inquiry, and receive from the different Presbyteries their overtures on the subject of Organic Union." This is Dr. Smith's statement in the *Southwestern Presbyterian* of July 19th, and we cordially adopt it in place of our own. It was on Friday morning, May 18th, after the presentation of the report by Dr. Strickler, that Dr. Smith offered his resolution. (See PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY for July 1888, pp. 288-'9.)

The sentence on p. 287, "Instead of being the first important matter settled, however, it was the last," was intended merely to furnish an historical statement of what actually occurred, viz.: that the Assembly did not finish up the reunion business on that 19th of May. It seemed desirable to the reviewer, however, to go on and complete the account of that matter. Hence we read next, "The committee reported on the tenth day, Monday, May 28th, in the afternoon," etc., etc.

Our article was written under the press and stress of our resumed duties as professor and also secretary of faculty, and the cry of the printers of the QUARTERLY for "copy." It is unnecessary to add that the mistake was wholly unintentional.

L. G. BARBOUR.

Richmond, Ky.

VIII. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

EWALD'S THEOLOGY.

OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY. *By Heinrich Ewald, late Professor in the University of Göttingen, Author of the "History of Israel," "Prophets of the Old Testament," etc.* Translated from the German, by the Rev. Thomas Goadby, B. A., President of the Baptist College, Nottingham. New York: Scribner & Welford, 743-745 Broadway. 8vo. pp. 458.

Ewald was born November 16, 1803, in Göttingen, and died at the same place May 4, 1875. He was one of the most learned men of Europe. Especially was he distinguished as an Orientalist. Nor was his genius inferior to his learning. His native endowments and his splendid scholarship constituted him one of the most remarkable men of the century. All this, however, furnished no guarantee of doctrinal soundness. Although this work hardly sustains the judgment which we have seen expressed of him, that he was a Rationalist, still it affords another proof of the necessity of the anointing from the Holy One to illuminate the most exalted intellect in the things which be of the Spirit of God.

The following explanatory remarks touching the work are made by the translator in his preface:

"As to the title of this volume, and the numbering of the sections, a word of explanation may be necessary. The original work is entitled, *Die Lehre der Bibel von Gott, oder Theologie des Alten und Neuen Bundes*, and consists of four volumes. The first volume discusses 'The Doctrine of the Word of God,' and a translation of the substance of it, omitting only the general introduction, has already been published under the title of *Revelation; Its Nature and Record*. The second and third volumes discuss 'The Doctrine of God and the Universe,' and from these volumes the present selection has been made, Ewald's alternative title of the whole work, *Old and New Testament Theology*, being adopted."

With reference to the method of theology in the general, the learned author has in the work before us said some admirable things. He justifies the principle upon which Systematic Theology proceeds, indeed upon which all theology worth the name must proceed, of comparing all the parts of the Scriptures together in order to grasp their catholic teachings. Biblical Theology does not, in his view, involve the interpretation of the earlier sections of the Bible simply in their own light, independently of the latter, the exposition, for example, of the Old Testament separately from the New. It is not merely a chronological development, step by step, until the last point is reached, but the earliest movement is made in the light of the latest, and each stage of the progress takes place with relation to all that succeeds it. A passage in Genesis—the first promise of redemption, for instance—receives its fullest interpretation in the consummation depicted in the Apocalypse. An historical treatment of theology, of course, there may be. Such was the plan upon which the great Jonathan Edwards projected a system of theology which his death prevented him from writing. But no one would be pre-

pared to execute such a task without having saturated himself with the whole spirit and genius of the Scriptures, or without having studied their whole contents from the beginning to the end. "To reduce," says the author, "the manifold contents of the Bible to a system of doctrine, pursuant to its own ultimate aim, is indispensable, has its service which nothing can replace, and in reality has been attempted in some form or other in every age." Every part of Scripture, it is true, ought to be studied in its immediate relations and in view of its own particular environment of circumstances and conditions, but every part is to be contemplated in its catholic connection with the whole. For both these methods Ewald very properly contends. He exalts neither at the expense of the other, and in avoiding this extravagance, now unhappily so common, he exhibits a good sense and judiciousness of thought which form a worthy accompaniment of his massive learning and brilliant scholarship. We make these remarks because of a tendency in some quarters to depreciate Systematic Theology, and to magnify what is called Biblical at its expense. With such an opinion this great biblical scholar, tinged with Rationalism though he is reputed to have been, appeared to have no sympathy. Each, according to him, pursues a special method of its own, but both concur in a general plan of treatment and in a common end, the reduction of scriptural truth to the harmony of a system.

The author's theistic views are very reverentially, clearly and sharply presented. He expresses the opinion that the atheist should not be so much met by argument as sternly rebuked for arrogance and folly, and says most forcibly:

"For all men the Bible is one, continuous, manifold, yet consistent proof of the reality of God, in the great characters, events and teachings he inspires, and in those deeper experiences which lead us in the great history of the world to find him afresh without whom that history were a dreary waste. The Bible must be utterly destroyed before doubt of God's existence can be other than a passing cloud over a firm, clear heaven."

Concerning the scriptural Names of God he makes acute observations which claim attention on account of his critical acquaintance with the Hebrew tongue. His discussion of the subject of Creation is characterized by philosophical breadth, sublime poetic conception, and magnificence of style. He occupies considerable space in demolishing the heathen idea of Chaos, and in vindicating the scriptural doctrine of the creation of all things, in the first instance, from nothing, by the omnific word of God. As the question of evolution is now prominent, it may interest the reader to know Ewald's estimate of Darwinism. After remarking that "without question the creation of will must be called the creation of a new world, the beginning and first spring of the whole present world, since it cannot be explained from the mere quiet and orderly progress and inner development of the previous creations," and after amplifying and elucidating that view, he says:

"What shall be said of Darwin and his imitators? They overlook all this, and, misled by the spectacle of a conflict for existence, like that enkindled to-day in the corrupt Franco-German world, and by their so far perverted taste, imagine the whole world of individual life as we see it now to have arisen similarly, the ape from the frog, the man from the ape! If they would only explain the bodily transitions from the one to the other, they could be endured and might be useful. But the one ultimate chief thing, the mental distinction, they overlook or deny, only because they are too inert or too dull to notice or appreciate it. Supposing themselves able to explain everything on their method, they really explain nothing

at all of that which has chiefly and specially to be explained, but they confuse everything more and more wantonly, and cripple all eagerness to recognize aright the true tasks and difficulties of a scientific investigation. Thus must it ever be; misapprehension and disavowal of what is spirit and God are always their own punishment."

In this part of the work he institutes an extremely interesting analysis into the teachings of the Old Testament Scriptures concerning the Son of God and the Holy Spirit, and proves beyond doubt, we think, that God revealed himself as tri-personal to the saints of the ancient dispensations. At this point we are forced to break utterly with the learned author. When he comes to develop his views in regard to the application of the plan of salvation to the necessities of men, he propounds doctrines which are entirely unscriptural, and which would practically exclude the possibility of a sinner's recovery from his guilt and ruin. Like the Arminian, he represents atonement, which he admits to be sacrificial in its character, as having been made for the human race universally; and, like him also, he holds that the will of the sinner is the determining factor in the matter of personal salvation. The divine activity and the human activity run in parallel lines, but the divine will never crosses the border between it and the human will, in order that the latter may be constrained. God is sovereign in his own sphere, and man in his. Like the Arminian, he perpetrates the stupendous blunder of treating the will of the sinner as being in the same category with the will of man in innocence. Ability always conditions and measures obligation. Man is free to do whatever he is required to do. As Kant, the prince of philosophical Legalists, has tersely put it, "If he *ought*, it follows that he *can*; and duty thus implies freedom." This is the prime fallacy in Ewald's, as it is in the Arminian's, soteriology. The Scriptures most certainly represent man, in his natural, unregenerate condition, as spiritually dead. It amounts then to this: One who has committed suicide *ought* still to be living. But *can* he resolve to live? The regenerating grace of God must give life to the sinner, and thus enable and determine his will to avail itself of a proffered salvation.

Ewald goes beyond the Arminian, in affirming that the righteousness which justifies and saves is a personal conformity to the demands of law and to the character of God. Of imputed righteousness he did not seem to have dreamed; at least he does not mention it, even to refute it. He might have been Lutheran enough to advert to Luther's "Commentary on Galatians" and to the "Formula of Concord." It is strange that a great biblical scholar, critically acquainted with the Epistles of Paul, should have maintained that faith in Christ discharges no other office than to make us subjectively righteous.

The author takes the ground, held by some recent advocates of what is called the "Wider Hope," that between his death and resurrection Christ actually descended to the "under world" and offered salvation to those who had died in their sins. The translator of this work attributes to the author the doctrine of the final annihilation of evil, and pronounces it extra-biblical. Were we to judge simply from the work before us, we would scarcely be able to subscribe to this opinion of the translator. Ewald again and again speaks of the eternal condemnation and the eternal punishment of the devil and of wicked human beings, and in one place of the Gehenna of fire, also of the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone. Evil, he says, will be eternally destroyed out of the kingdom of God when it shall reach

its final consummation; but the elimination of evil from glorified humanity, which he asserts, does not necessarily imply its elimination from the universe. The author, however, is somewhat obscure in his treatment of this subject, and we refrain from expressing a positive judgment as to his meaning.

We close this brief and inadequate notice with an expression of the pleasure we experienced in observing that this distinguished scholar rejected the rationalistic interpretation of the celebrated exclamation of Job, beginning, "I know that my Redeemer liveth." He represents this thought as overpowering the Patriarch, "that without doubt certainly he shall see God *after death* as his Redeemer."

The mechanical execution of the book is, to our taste, perfect. There is no amendment which we could suggest.

JOHN L. GIRARDEAU.

DR. LINDSAY ALEXANDER'S THEOLOGY.

A SYSTEM OF BIBLICAL THEOLOGY. *By the late W. Lindsay Alexander, D. D., LL. D., Principal of the Theological Hall of the Congregational Churches in Scotland, Minister of Augustine Church, Edinburgh, etc., etc.* In two volumes. New York: Scribner & Welford, 743-745 Broadway. 8vo. pp. 973.

The author of this work, as will be perceived from the title-page, was a Congregationalist divine, professor of theology in the Theological Hall of the Congregationalist churches in Scotland. Dr. Ralph Wardlaw and himself were the most conspicuous ornaments of that denomination in Scotland. The latter enjoyed considerable reputation for theological learning, as is evinced by the fact that his services were enlisted by the editors of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, a fact which at the same time gives a broad hint that, like Dr. Caird and Prof. Robertson Smith who were similarly invoked for contributions, he was rather in repute for a certain latitudinarian tendency in theology, than for adherence to the standards of strict orthodoxy. This presumption is strengthened by an examination of his *System of Theology*.

The editor, in his Preface, offers the following explanations:

"This work consists of lectures delivered by the late Dr. Lindsay Alexander to the students of the Theological Hall of the Congregational Churches in Scotland. The course of theological study in that institution extended over four years, in each session of which Dr. Alexander delivered lectures on one of the four divisions of theology given in these volumes. Although he held the post of Professor of Theology for the long period of twenty-nine years, he was in the habit of carefully revising and largely rewriting his lectures for each successive session, and those now printed were, for the most part, written by him during the last few years of his life, while those written at an earlier date show marks of careful revision. All of them may therefore be regarded as setting forth his matured views on theological subjects.

"I have to note that I have been compelled to omit a large part of the matter of the MSS. . . : In regard to the omissions, however, I have endeavored to act under the guidance of the author himself, furnished in those indications given in several of his introductory lectures (selections from which form the Introduction to this work) of what he regarded as the main body of his teaching, and what he regarded as merely introductory or subsidiary to that. In the closing part of the Introduction it will be found that he aimed at the 'construction of a Biblical rather than a Dogmatical or Ecclesiastical [!] Theology.' . . Most of the lectures omitted fall under Parts I. and II., Theology proper and Anthropology. From Part I. the omissions are of lectures on the 'Concept of God' and the 'Existence of God,' including discussions on the argument *a priori*, the historical, physical, anthropo-

logical, and teleological arguments. Several lectures and parts of lectures on modern speculations regarding the origin, creation and antiquity of man, have also been omitted from Part II., on the ground of the lecturer's distinct intimation that, although he entered upon the discussion of these subjects for the benefit of the students, he regarded this as somewhat aside from his function as a teacher and expounder of the Biblical doctrine concerning man. . . . The reasons given for producing the work in the form of a treatise on Biblical Theology have also determined its title. It is a Biblical Theology in the sense, to use the author's own words, that it is an attempt to 'collect and classify the different statements of Scripture so as to present the truth in its purely Biblical form, and under the modifications which are peculiar to each writer;' and it is a 'System' of Biblical Theology in the sense that the author has aimed at 'a systematic and scientific expression of the contents and full meaning of what the Bible states only in germ, or loosely and popularly.'

These somewhat extensive extracts from the editor's Preface have been given for the purpose of calling attention to the emphasis laid upon Biblical Theology and the implied disparagement of Systematic. We do not allude to the "discipline" known as Biblical Theology in the German universities. The sort of theology which, under the name of Biblical, is exalted by the author and the editor of the work under consideration is a different thing; and the implication that it more faithfully represents the contents of the Bible than what is known as Systematic Theology is incorrect and invidious. In the first place, Dr. Alexander intimates that he prefers Biblical Theology to Systematic or Dogmatic, because the latter is ecclesiastical—that is, incorporates into its matter the deliverances and creeds of the church, as well as the pure statements of the Scriptures. The Systematic Theologian follows the church, he the Bible. Now, this amounts to a charge that Protestant theologians have generally departed from their great principle that the Bible alone is the source and rule of theology, and have adopted, in part at least, the canon of Rome, that the authority of the church sustains that relation to theology. The implied allegation is serious, and we have no hesitation in saying that it is not founded in fact. It is true that the Dogmatic Theologian frequently appeals to the *consensus* of the church, but it is at the same time true that he treats it not as possessed of original or of ultimate authority, but as a mighty and venerable presumption in favor of the doctrines supported by it. The suffrages of Christ's true people in the past is not to be despised. It is not to be supposed that they would be generally and permanently deprived of the illumination of the Holy Ghost in their interpretations of his Word. This is the significance of the citation by Systematic Theologians of the digested belief of the church. Nor can it be with propriety overlooked that they refer ecclesiastical creeds, in the last resort, to the Scriptures for their justification. No Protestant theologian, so far as we know, appeals to the Bible and the church as coördinate authorities. The Word of God he regards as supreme. In the second place, suppose that the Systematic Theologian invokes the church's interpretation of the Scriptures, Dr. Alexander leans upon his own. After all it comes to this: That a common consent of opinions exists in the one case, and in the other, the opinion of a single individual. If Dr. Alexander girds at the Dogmatic Theologian for adopting an ecclesiastical theology, it may be retorted that he adopts an Alexandrian; and we deem ourselves as venial in kicking against an Alexandrian theology as he esteems himself in refusing the yoke of an ecclesiastical. In the third place, what Dr. Alexander censures the Systematic Theologian for doing, he does himself. We are acquainted with no recent theological writer who more freely than he employs scholastic distinctions and Latin tech-

nicalities. We find no fault with him on this account. On the contrary, we regard his work as especially valuable to students for that reason. A good distinction, perhaps all the more because couched in a foreign or dead language, is a great thing. The glory of Turretin is that he is a master of distinctions. But it *is* objected, that one who uses this method has no right to criticise another for employing it, and claim that he alone sticks to Scripture—he is the Biblical Theologian. The wonder is that one who sets up such a claim should not lecture and write in the very words of Scripture without any of his own. He would produce a Biblical Theology in perfection; it would be the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible. We commend that method to the exalters of Biblical and depreciators of Systematic Theology. They would be charmingly consistent with themselves, and the result would be a far better Biblical Theology than some we wot of, than even that under consideration. In the fourth place, the Systematic Theologian is commonly about as biblical as the Biblical. Our author, notwithstanding his fling at Dogmatic Theology, enters into formal discussions as ratiocinative as those of a Schoolman. Take up the Systematic Theology of Calvin and observe how Scripture is incorporated into the very staple of his discussions. Look at an edition of the Institutes, in which the proof-texts from the Bible are collected at the bottom of the pages rather than allowed to remain in the text, and almost each page wears the aspect of a column resting on a pedestal of Scripture. He, however, was not a Biblical, he was only a Dogmatic Theologian! We doubt whether there is in the compass of theological literature a presentation of the subject of the Trinity that is so thoroughly biblical as that contained in Charles Hodge's "Systematic Theology." True, he also expounds the church-doctrine, but he does it with a view to evince its accord with the doctrine of the divine Word, as well as to exhibit the consent of the people of God to the teachings of that Word.

We are at a loss to account for the slighting tone now so often indulged in by professedly christian writers with reference to Systematic Theology, except upon the painful supposition of a growing laxity of doctrinal views in the church. The note is that of the *sinister cornix*; it bodes no good. When the theology of Augustin, of Calvin, of Owen is bidden to the rear, the Biblical Theology substituted for its effete teaching will be a false light, a precursor of defection and a signal of apostasy. Systematic Theology should hold itself open to every new contribution to the understanding of the Scriptures which may be furnished by Exegetical Theology with its critical and philological apparatus, for while the Bible is an invulnerable, our knowledge of it is a variable, quantity; yet as the human mind cannot rest short of the unity of system, Exegetical Theology must ever be the handmaid of Systematic.

Room is left for only a brief expression of our estimate of Dr. Alexander as a theologian. He was unquestionably characterized by decided ability, and possessed of a high degree of technical learning in theology. We have read his work with interest and profit. There are certain questions, especially those which he himself regarded as extra-biblical, upon which he exhibits great judiciousness of thought. But on the whole we cannot regard him as equal to either of his great contemporaries, Cunningham, Hodge and Thornwell. Especially is he not the peer of the last-named of these illustrious men in philosophical grasp and profound analysis. He breaks with the Calvinistic theology, as has been already indicated in excerpts from the editor's Preface to his work, upon some very important points, and yet

does not symbolize with the Arminian. We are apt to think that any theological system interjected between these two, like the corn poured into the hopper, is likely to be triturated between the upper and the nether millstone. He affirms neither Calvinism nor Arminianism; he affirms Alexandrianism. His system is *sui generis*, as might have been expected from his dislike to "Dogmatic or Ecclesiastical Theology;" and unless it be a supreme revelation of theological truth which is destined to eclipse and supersede all other systems, there is no assumption of prophetic sagacity in forecasting for it neither a wide nor a permanent influence.

The paper, the printing, the binding of these volumes are simply exquisite. The beauty of the book would tempt a Calvinist to read the strictures on Imputation, and an Arminian the censure of Universal Atonement.

JOHN L. GIRARDEAU.

THE NEW THEOLOGY IN THE ANTIPODES.

THE REIGN OF GRACE. A Discussion of the Question of the Possibility of Salvation for all Men in this Life, or in the Life to Come. *By William Salmond, D. D., Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy, University of Otago, New Zealand.* Dunedin: James Horsburgh. 1888. pp. 64, 12mo. (Fourth Thousand.)

THE DAY OF SALVATION, obscured in a recent pamphlet on "The Reign of Grace." *By Rev. James Macgregor, D. D., Oamaru.* Dunedin: New Zealand Bible, Tract, and Book Depository. 1888. pp. 72, 12mo.

These two pamphlets bring us news of the outbreak of the "new theology" at the ends of the earth. Dr. William Salmond, formerly Professor of Theology in the Theological School of the Presbyterian "Church of Otago and Southland," almost immediately on his transference to the chair of Mental and Moral Philosophy in the University of Otago (a chair endowed by and apparently filled by nomination of the Synod), startles the church by the publication of this pamphlet, in which he proclaims his adherence to an extreme form of the teaching of the "new theology" as to human destiny. He feels how equivocal the situation is and anticipates "the barbed question," why he has kept silence until it has become "convenient" to himself to speak. Of course the question is asked; and in the vigorous hands of Dr. Macgregor it becomes a severe arraignment of the at least apparent immorality of years of silent acceptance of the emoluments of the church "as teacher of that doctrine which at the time he did not believe," followed by almost immediate speech so soon as "he was placed by his church in his present office, where for the present his temporal interest is secured independently of her will." It has been the misfortune of the "new theology" that it has produced as yet few martyrs.

Dr. Salmond's pamphlet is admirably and strongly written, and seems to spring from an earnest spirit upon which the ills of humanity weigh heavily. It is characterized by a degree of candor unusual in books of its class. Its precise contention is for "an extension of time during which the mercy of God endures for repentant sinners" (p. 46); and the church doctrine to which it is most pointedly opposed is, therefore, that which teaches that death ends probation. "Probation" is scarcely a suitable word to use, however, in this connection, for it seems to imply that the issue may be doubtful, while Dr. Salmond cannot but hope that the persistent mercy of God will bring all souls back to him, though he will not dogmatically assert it. The doctrine of the pamphlet is thus an undogmatic universalism; it is even frankly said that no kind of answer can be given on its theory "if only

one soul were lost" (p. 51), and if any one is not saved, certainly God "will not uphold him in existence for no reason but to inflict tortures on him through endless ages" (pp. 63-4). There is clearly a more serious departure from confessional theology here than mere universalism, and Dr. Salmond is candid enough to confess it. Here is a changed view of the condition of man, of the relation of God to man, of the relation of Christ's work, and even of the nature of God himself. The author very correctly perceives that the roots of the whole matter are set in the question as to "the Divine Nature and Attributes." Is he a just and holy God who hates sin and will visit it with his displeasure? or is he Love in such a sense that he has no displeasure, and, by necessity of nature, must withhold his hand? Dr. Salmond stands for the latter view.

Of course such teaching has not been permitted to pass unchallenged. The ablest reply that it has as yet called forth, is the second pamphlet named at the head of this notice, which comes from the pen of Dr. Macgregor, formerly Professor of Theology in the Free Church College, Edinburgh. Its hasty preparation will doubtless account for the traces of insufficient dignity that sometimes mar its style. But as a refutation of Dr. Salmond it is fully adequate. Dr. Macgregor rightly makes the doctrine of God central to the discussion and shows that the contention that God must prolong his proposals of mercy into the next world rests on a conception of him which denies that "he doeth all things according to the counsel of his will," and places his activities under the direction of a grinding necessity arising from his love conceived of not as the love of choice but as that of mere general benevolence, to which is allowed no power of will to choose the recipients of its benefits or to fit its favors to desert. Thus we are brought perilously near to an impersonal and non-moral necessity in substitution for the christian God. Dr. Macgregor next insists that the real question is after all not what such a God must do, but what the real God has said he will do. And here Dr. Salmond has confessed judgment, as he admits that his theory will not agree with the sayings of Christ, who, he will have us believe, habitually spoke with the fervor of a popular preacher and thus failed to preserve that equilibrium between the urgency of the preacher and the calm of the religious philosopher for which we must strive.

What the outcome of the controversy will be for the little church whose peace it has broken can scarcely be foreseen. But thinking men will not fail to note Dr. Salmond's witness to the opinion which is so rapidly gaining ground in America, that the "new theology" is but the natural fruitage of the new views which were sown so broadcast a generation ago, and that it stands, therefore, as the historical judgment upon them. If men "affirm without qualification the Universal Fatherhood of God, and his equal love to all men, that Christ died for all men and every separate man [in the same sense], and that God unequivocally wills that all men should be saved," they will find no harmony for their teachings "with the ways of God in Providence and the facts of human life, if death puts an absolute limit to the possibility of salvation." Men are not treated with equal love here. "Let us go back, if we will," he adds with the greatest justice, "to the stern attitude of those who pointed to these things as proof of God's eternal decree of preterition; but, if not, let us not shrink from the inevitable inference that here we see but a part of the ways of God with men, and that the message of mercy must needs resound in both worlds." The advice is good. The vagaries of the newest theology of our day is the *reductio ad absurdum* of the new teachings of the last generation and God's scourge to drive men back to his truth.

B. B. WARFIELD.

LADD'S WHAT IS THE BIBLE?

WHAT IS THE BIBLE? An Inquiry into the Origin and Nature of the Old and New Testaments in the Light of Modern Biblical Study. *By George T. Ladd, D. D., Professor of Philosophy in Yale University.* 12mo, pp. xiv., 497. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1888.

This book is an abridgment in popular form of the author's more elaborate work entitled "The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture," published in 1883. It is "dedicated to that great multitude of readers of the English Bible who reverently follow it as their guide in christian faith and christian life."

The design of the book is set forth by the author in the preface, as follows:

"The purpose of the book is apologetic. It is written in the interest of faith. Its author heartily accepts all the principles and tenets of Biblical religion, including that Reformation view of the Bible itself which makes the christian find in it his only authentic and sufficient source of what is true for him to believe and right for him to do in matters appertaining to salvation. Indeed, the chief purpose of the book is practical, and has reference to vindicating this christian use of the Bible. In other words, I should be glad to show clearly and convincingly that modern critical study of the Bible has discovered nothing which need disturb, much less can undermine and destroy, the intelligent employment of holy Scripture as the believer's rule of faith and life."

The author's spirit is commendable, and his tone is healthful; the favorable prepossession created by these paragraphs is much mitigated, however, by discovering on the very next page that

"The reader of this book will find that our verdict cannot be altogether so favorable as to the possibility of reconciling the results of the modern scholar's study of the Biblical writings with certain opinions current *about* the origin and nature of the Bible. But if he reads with candor and care, he will see that neither fidelity to the teachings of the Bible itself, nor adherence to the substance and spirit of the doctrine of the church, requires him to hold these opinions; and reading in this way he can scarcely fail to see that the facts, as biblical science presents them, do not permit him to hold them. But this need occasion no alarm for the foundations of faith or for the fate of the Bible."

We must confess to an utter failure to see any fulfilment of the promise in the latter half of the extract; such candor and care as we have been able to exercise lead us to question the value of the point he makes here in the outset, when he endeavors to distinguish between the Bible and certain current opinions *about* the Bible, a point not only important but vital to his position as a writer in the interest of faith. And yet we fear he has made a distinction without a difference. To illustrate: Suppose one asks you, reader, to distinguish carefully between your wife and opinions current about your wife; said opinions accredit her with gentle descent, spotless character, sweet disposition, intelligence, cultivation and refinement; whereas this student of human nature, this delver after genealogical roots, proposes to prove that instead of being what she is currently supposed to be she is, on the contrary, an illegitimate child of very undesirable parentage, not altogether so pure herself as she has the reputation of being, rather silly, and of a coarse nature, veneered by an acute adaptability to favorable surroundings. Suppose that his scientific inquiry into the origin and nature of your wife were to establish this fact, would it not occasion some alarm for the foundations of your home or for the fate of your wife? Such criticism might leave you a *woman*, but it would rob you of a wife.

And so candor compels us to say that it is vain for our author to guard his discussion with any such distinction as this; he may leave us a book, a very reverend, valuable, precious book, *but he takes away the Bible*. That he is himself aware of this fact is evidenced by the particular pains he is at so repeatedly to reiterate the assertion that such views do not injure the value of the Scriptures; the very frequency of this claim is significant.

He distinctly reopens the whole question of the canon; not only so, but he keeps it perpetually open. Each succeeding generation is encouraged, under the guidance of a progressive biblical criticism, to reopen and settle for itself this question. Each book from Genesis to Revelation is subject to continual challenge; more than this, every narrative, incident, miracle, is put upon the defensive; the right of each to record is in issue.

The guides to a verdict in each case seem to be:

1. Historical Biblical Criticism.
2. The Christian Consciousness.
3. The Christo-centric theory.

As to the first, we remark that its rules are very arbitrary, and, judging by the specimens we have seen, its results are utterly untrustworthy; if we discount confident assertion and substract pure conjecture, the remainder is ridiculously small. These facts, when viewed in connection with the conflict of the varying schools and their contradictory verdicts, are sufficient to sweep the whole thing, *as a science*, out of the court of common sense.

The Christian Consciousness as used by these writers is nothing but a name, and has no existence outside of the vocabulary of "Progressive Orthodoxy." Granting it existence, however, its function as a judge in this inquiry involves an absurdity.

We are told that "the community of believers is the ultimate authority, its moral and religious consciousness the last appeal." "It is through the inspired community of believers that God has made his Word of Redemption known, and their enlightened moral and religious consciousness is the only conceivable final test of the right of any alleged truth to be called by this sacred name." But we are also taught that whatever value and authority inhere in this christian consciousness are derived from the Holy Scriptures; the Bible is its source, the Word of God is its creator, preserver and enlightener. Now, when it turns around and undertakes to sit in judgment on the Bible, it seems to us to assume the rather ridiculous position of essaying to saw off the very limb on which it is sitting. We wish it all success in such noble endeavor.

The Christo-centric theory is one which proposes to weigh the claim of any part of the biblical records to inspiration according to its relation to the revelation of Christ to the world, such claim to be voted strong or weak in proportion as this relation is direct or remote; *e. g.*, the first chapter of John would have much stronger claim than the twentieth of Exodus.

There might be some such criterion of the importance, timeliness, practical value of the various portions of the Scripture, but how such a rule could be established as a test of inspiration perplexes us. Inspiration is not concerned with the importance of a statement, but with its truth. Two incidents may be equally true and yet very far from being equally valuable or important. In order to any application of the foregoing test, a critic must undertake to decide what degree of im-

portance or value is requisite in any narrative to justify the Almighty in embodying it in his inspired Word; and while critics are not generally marked by modesty in excess, yet most would shrink from such a function. It is always barely possible, to say the least, that an omniscient God might have had somewhere on the earth and some time in the ages some purpose to subserve that the sapient critic may not now perceive.

The application of critical tests like these needs severe restraint, more reverent by far than is probable in such view of inspiration as our author seems to teach. In this doctrine he appears abreast with the most "advanced."

"Inspiration is, more than anything else, the quickening and elevating of the moral consciousness."

"Indeed, so close is the relation which exists between the revelation and inspiration of the biblical writers and the revelation and inspiration of the discoverers of poetic or scientific truth, that the differences between the two concern chiefly the nature of the truth divinely imparted."

"The inspiration which produced the biblical books is, *specifically* considered, the same illumining, quickening, elevating, and purifying work which goes on in the entire community of believing souls."

"Not a single claim to the ability to write *errorless* Scripture, whether with respect to historical, linguistic, geographical, or ethical contents of truth, exists in all the Bible from Genesis to Revelation."

When views of inspiration so lax as these undertake the application of tests so unreliable as the three foregoing, we must be pardoned for saying that we cannot receive the results with any copious confidence. The reader need not be surprised to find large portions of the "biblical records" discredited entirely, and in what remains imperfections, errors, defects, mistakes, many and manifold. We had marked much of the book for specific criticism, but our space is too limited to allow any detailed discussion of it. There are few works within our reading more open to objection. We regret exceedingly that Professor Ladd should have thought the Word of God in need of any such defence as this volume contains. It may possibly prove an aid to some doubters, but we do not envy the type of faith that will be strengthened by it. It is even more likely to injure than to benefit; and we are at a loss to say which class we pity most, those who are hurt or those who are helped.

SAMUEL M. SMITH.

FOSTER'S SEMINARY METHOD OF ORIGINAL STUDY, ETC.

THE SEMINARY METHOD OF ORIGINAL STUDY IN THE HISTORICAL SCIENCES ILLUSTRATED FROM CHURCH HISTORY. *By Frank Hugh Foster, Ph. D. (Leipzig), Professor of Church History in the Theological Seminary at Oberlin.* 12mo, pp. xi., 129. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1888.

Says Professor Foster in his introductory chapter:

"A *method* is the object of the chapters that follow. The discussion is limited for convenience' sake to the historical sciences, and thereby the necessity of considering too wide a variety of methods is avoided. Something must be allowed to the necessities of the case in the way of limitations of the illustrations, and in the form of the whole. The writer's relation to a theological seminary, and the present and prospective requirements of his own pupils have naturally led him to select his illustrations principally from church history. But essentially all that is to be said will apply with suitable modifications to any historical science as well as to church history, and to every other positive and advancing science, though less directly.

If the student or the teacher has really seized the idea of the method, he will easily make the necessary modifications for the special study he has in mind himself." (Pp. 3, 4.)

The Seminary Method is not essentially different, then, from that employed in the chemical, or physical, or physiological laboratory. The object in all is to bring the student face to face with the facts, and to make him, in some degree at least, an independent investigator. "No man is truly a student in any branch until he is an original student. He is never fully interested in study till he begins to pursue it for himself by original methods." The design of the Historical Seminary is to furnish him opportunity for training by actually doing original work under the guidance of an experienced worker. "It is a workshop where the student is taught to make history. It is a place where the beginner may acquire methods, and where the advanced student may do work which shall contribute to the sum of human knowledge." (P. 18.)

After having thus defined the Historical Seminary, and then described its outfit, the author devotes a chapter to each of the following topics: The Necessary Preparation for Seminary Study; The Method of Original Study; Detailed Examples; The Place of Original Study of History in a Theological Seminary; The Uses and Limits of the Method in Colleges. In an appendix, covering fourteen pages, there is given a useful list of topics, together with miscellaneous information and suggestions as to method.

The task which Professor Foster set before him in the preparation of this volume was well worth doing. Although Historical Seminaries in successful operation are no longer a novelty in this country, yet many instructors in this department have had no acquaintance with them. In this book all necessary information is given. There are also many valuable suggestions made as to the application of the method. The concluding chapter, which discusses the Uses and Limits of the Method in Colleges, is very judicious, and cannot fail to be helpful to those who give instruction in such institutions. The chapter on The Place of Original Study of History in a Theological Seminary deserves the especial attention of all who are interested in ministerial education. It can leave upon the mind of the candid reader no doubt that there is room for vast improvement in this regard in our schools of training for the ministry. This subject, however, is too large for discussion here. It deserves fuller notice, which it is to be hoped it will receive.

J. F. LATIMER.

KERR'S PEOPLE'S HISTORY OF PRESBYTERIANISM.

THE PEOPLE'S HISTORY OF PRESBYTERIANISM IN ALL AGES. By Robert P. Kerr, D. D., author of "*Presbyterianism for the People*." 12mo, pp. 284. \$1.25. Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1888.

We have here a book in every way to be commended. It is published in good style, printed on good tinted paper, in clear type, and well bound, so that reading it is a pleasure. It is at a reasonable price also, so that it is in reach of "the people" for whom it is written. The book is a happy conception, and happily executed. It fills a place that was waiting for it. Its aim is an admirable one, to present a succinct history of the Presbyterian Church in a popular manner for the members of the Presbyterian family. It is the "*People's History*." The style is

clear and attractive; the language well-chosen, and the whole subject is presented in a graphic and interesting manner.

Its object is not to give an exhaustive history of the Church, but to fix attention on the leading points, and tell succinctly what has been the history of the Presbyterian Church since Luke closed his records of what was done in apostolic days, and since Paul's picture of a model church made up of "the saints in Christ Jesus with the elders and deacons," which can only be seen now in every church under the Presbyterian faith and confession. Dr. Kerr has told this story with the true spirit of the historian.

The book is not written for scholars, but for the people; yet it is accurate and fair, and shows that the author has profited by modern investigations and views. Thus he does not make the extravagant claim for the Waldenses and Culdees which some have made, yet shows that there was that in their history which was indisputable, that could only be explained by the theory of Presbyterian origin. That argument is really stronger than to set up extravagant claims that can be controverted, and shows them not only to have been substantially Presbyterian in their church life as then exhibited, but also that the impress of apostolic days had never been lost. When almost the same can be shown in every land where there was a break with Rome, and the church was reaching after more scriptural life, you have an argument whose force cannot be escaped.

In his brief chapter on "Presbyterianism in England," the author shows that the reason England did not become Presbyterian as Scotland, was not that the people did not turn to Presbyterianism, but Presbyterianism and monarchy did not agree. Henry VIII. wanted a church of which he could be the head, hence he established the Church of England. Elizabeth could not bend the Presbyterian Church to her will, and therefore crushed it. She did not want to be troubled in England as Queen Mary was in Scotland with that spirit of liberty which Presbyterianism engenders.

The history of Presbyterianism in England is largely yet an unwritten chapter, and awaits a pen to show that that church which lays such stress on the historic episcopate, had its corner-stone laid by Henry VIII., because "Presbyterianism and monarchy agree with each other as God and devil agree."

This book has come at a time when it was needed. We see such statements as that "Calvinism is dying out in the world," or that by a diocesan bishop, recently made, that "Calvinism has always produced a spirit of intolerance." It is well to have the people see how little foundation there is for such statements. It is well that the world should be again reminded of the debt it owes for civil liberty, and that other churches, which make slings of intolerance against Calvinism, should see they owe the religious liberty they enjoy chiefly to the heroic struggles of Calvinists, who loved liberty for themselves and wanted others to enjoy the same rich boon.

"Produced intolerance?" We wondered what the bishop had been reading. Certainly not the history of Christ's church, for that shows that the great battles for religious freedom were fought by those of whose deeds this book is a brief history; by those who loved, as our author well says, "an institution which has accomplished more for the welfare of mankind than all other agencies, except the gospel, for which it has been a fitting vehicle." What would the history of freedom be if the names of William the Silent and William of Orange, John Calvin and John Knox were blotted out? Or without the heroic sufferings and sacrifices of

the Alps and the mountains and glens of Scotland, of the green fields of England, of the fertile fields of France, of the dykes of the Netherlands? Who are those that wrote with their blood the sad but glorious page of martyr history? This book tells us once more that God has called the Presbyterian Church "to suffer these great things for him." They are the ones who have bought with their blood the priceless boon of liberty. The action of the Presbytery of Hanover and of the Presbyterians of Mecklenburg was but the evidence that these same principles were imbedded in their hearts. We are enjoying the results of their labors, as this book shows.

We rely for the proof of our apostolicity on the conformity of Presbyterianism to the word of God. Yet it is well for the people to see the safe historical grounds on which we base our claims.

The history of Presbyterianism in the United States is presented to us fairly, and shows the position of the Southern Church in its relations to the Northern, and the action of each prior to the establishment of fraternal relations, in which the Southern Church has certainly nothing to be ashamed of, and is glad for the church at large to have the whole history presented.

The statistical data gathered from the most reliable sources available show the relative strength of Presbyterianism in the world, and can be effectively used for the benefit of croakers and those ignorant of our numbers. This book ought to be in every Presbyterian home. It deserves and ought to command a large sale. Every pastor may safely commend it as a judicious, admirable, and yet catholic history; and he ought to see that it is in the Sabbath-school library and in the church library where our country and village churches have fallen on the good plan of having one. It is the right book on the right theme and at the right time.

J. W. ROSEBRO.

COOKE'S CREDENTIALS OF SCIENCE THE WARRANT OF FAITH.

THE CREDENTIALS OF SCIENCE THE WARRANT OF FAITH. *By Josiah Parsons Cooke, LL. D., Erving Professor of Chemistry and Mineralogy in Harvard University.* Pp. 324. \$1.75. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1888.

This is a volume of lectures which were delivered first before Union Theological Seminary, New York, and subsequently before the Lowell Institute, Boston. The following is the table of contents: I. The Argument of Natural Theology. II. Preparing the Way. III. The Induction of Newton. IV. Deduction. V. Examples of Scientific Investigation. VI. Laws of Nature. VII. Determinate and Indeterminate Laws. VIII. Theories or Systems of Science. IX. Predominant Principles of Scientific Thought. X. The Systems Compared—Religion and Science.

In these lectures our author looks at the christian religion from the view-point of natural physical science. He construes our theology into a mere secular philosophy, and then proceeds to test it in the light of those credentials which warrant an hypothesis or theory of physics. To our view, the very starting point abandons high vantage ground, and we cannot expect the argument to rise higher than its major premise. The christian religion refuses to be thus degraded. It is God-like, who is high and lifted up above all the earth. It is a unique and distinctive system, and rejoices to stand on its own evidences. It is derived principally from

a Book, and that Book, in the investigation of its system, cannot be thrown out of the count. Grant the divinity of the Book, and there is no need to coördinate faith and gravitation. We feel that an indignity is put upon Christ when he is required to stand at the bar of human judgment the equal, and only the equal in this respect, of Copernicus. We feel like protesting against our religion being laid alongside of the undulatory theory of light, to be examined and judged in precisely the same way. We say, therefore, that our author is asking too much when he asks us to put our religion into the same category with the molecular theory of the physicist, to be accredited or discredited by the same canons of judgment. It is the incongruity of yoking the ox and the ass. Still, while we object to abandoning our high ground of apologetics, even to construct an argument which, in the realm of science, will have the force of an *argumentum ad hominem* merely, not indeed because there is any intrinsic wrong in the procedure, but mainly because it is always a bad policy to take low ground when a high and commanding position could be just as easily occupied, we rejoice that Dr. Cooke, on this field, gives the victory to christianity. He, as a scientific expert, thinks those credentials which warrant faith in scientific generalizations, being transferred to christianity, warrant faith in the religion of the Nazarene. But because the ground assumption was low, the final conclusion is not of the highest order. Still we rejoice that his conclusion was not otherwise.

In his first lecture our author contributes another chapter to the volume of inconclusive reasoning on the subject of natural theology. His contention here is that the inductive method requires the generalization of a God. He states his conclusion: "In nature man found Energy, Fitness, Beauty, Order, and Sacrifice; and through these he has been led to recognize Might, Skill, Perfection, Law, and Love, in a Supreme Intelligence." This being, with these perfections, is the product of a pure induction. But the God of the Bible is an infinite being—a being, as related to space, immense; as related to duration, eternal; as related to the grounds of existence, independent; as related to the contents of himself, all-sufficient; and as related to his permanence, immutable. All of these attributes are but relations of the infinite, and so are summed up in that perfection. This is the true God. None other ought to be sought after nor regarded as satisfactory. Now we ask, How can a pure induction, which goes from the particular to the general, predicate the attribute of *infinity* of the world-making and world-governing intelligence? There is no particular infinite in nature from which we can go to the general infinite which is God. Induction, therefore, while it gives perhaps more than our author claims, cannot convey us to *God as he is*. In our opinion, the *a priori*, the cosmological, the teleological, the ontological, the moral, the religious, and the biblical arguments, as they are called, must be fused into one to give us *God as he is*, and when they are thus fused the argument crushes infidelity as with the weight of a falling world. The difficulty is that men persist in travelling towards the unbounded globe of deity on a straight line, and so obtain only partial knowledge. The problem is to know God as infinite; and a listing of the traces of himself in nature cannot present him to us, because he has not revealed his infinite self in this finite world.

At this time, when the miracle is being so impudently assaulted, we rejoice to find this apostle of science boldly affirming their *possibility* as he stands in the very bosom of nature. With miracles as facts he had nothing to do. He says: "Let it

be understood that I make no claim to substantiate or explain miracles; but I do maintain that we cannot disprove divine interference in the course of nature, and that the scientific probabilities against such occurrences may be fairly set off against the moral presumptions in their favor." This is refreshing.

Our author is a disciple of Professor Louis Agassiz, and consequently holds to the doctrine of "organic types" advanced and advocated by his great master. Still he thinks Darwinism ought to be treated with great respect, and denies that it necessarily collides with the Bible, even at the point of man's evolution. Every fundamental postulate of Darwinism, he says, is still invested with doubt. He believes that it is destined to give way to the theory of his former preceptor. "If man be descended from 'an anthropoid animal of arboreal habits,' it is passing strange that, so far as any direct evidence goes, he should have appeared on the earth thus suddenly, and that we can find no traces of his progenitors, either of the first, second, third, or of any other generation." But, pshaw! Evolution can have paroxysms whenever it gets into a tight place, and when it recovers from the spasm it is always on the other side of the yawning chasm! It is a poor epileptic hypothesis! It has *fits*!

The spirit of our author is delightful. As a scientist, he is not imperious, and as a christian, he is reverent. We have read his book with pleasure.

R. A. WEBB.

STUCKENBERG'S INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF PHILOSOPHY.

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF PHILOSOPHY. *By J. H. W. Stuckenberg, D. D.* Crown 8vo, pp. 419. \$2.00. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1888.

We have read this octavo with unusual pleasure and profit. Indeed, its merits are such as to sustain attention and interest from lid to lid. We have in it all that goes to make the delightful volume: the subject-matter, the literary style, the method of treatment, the mechanical "get-up," are all of the highest order of merit. The publishers have printed it on soft, snow-white paper, and in the clearest long primer, doubly-ledged type: the printed page simply ravishes our eye. The subject is one which possesses peculiar attractions for us personally, and one which we think especially valuable in our unstable and superficial times. The method of treatment is so logical as to satisfy the most fastidious lover of order and system; and the style is perspicuous and vivacious, and therefore charming. We began reading with the cold critical faculty at the front; but we were soon so captivated, that we found ourselves changed from a critical scavenger into a warm personal friend; and now doubt whether we have not become so enamored as to be incompetent to exercise the office of a judge.

Two sentences from the preface indicate the author's specific aim in his volume, and we think he has "stuck to his text," which is his title. "It is not an encyclopædia; nor is it intended as an introduction to any particular philosophical system, or to the history of the various systems, but to the study of philosophy itself. The book was not written for philosophers, but for students and others who desire to prepare themselves for philosophic pursuits." There is certainly a place in philosophical literature for a volume which happily realizes this idea.

A logical order in the development of our author's subject, would require first of all an introductory chapter, in which he would circulate round about the main

subject, clearly defining the object of his search, illustrating its importance, and in the general preparing the way for entering upon the main investigation, which should follow immediately this ground-clearing. This our author has done in his INTRODUCTION. Having thus come up to his subject, he then distributes it according to a strict logical demand. "First, the Nature of philosophy is considered; then its Relation to adjacent subjects; its general Divisions are then given, and these are followed by an explanation of each division; and last of all the Spirit and Method in the study of philosophy are discussed." We think it will be conceded that, if this outline has been adequately and ably filled out, the resultant treatise must possess high value for the end had in view. Our object in what follows will be to give the meagerest sketch of the manner in which this has been done.

I. *The Nature of Philosophy.* Here the search is for a definition, which will set the intricate subject clearly before the student. After making observations upon a multitude of confusions, our author says: "It will be found that there is a sense which gives the essence of the etymology, as well as of the historic use of the term; which contains what is common to the great systems; which marks an important and distinct department of thought; and which also gives the idea on which the present intelligent use of the word is based" (p. 21). In this quotation we have laid down the principles which the author thinks are determinate of the definition. He then sets out under these guiding principles to discover the real nature of philosophy, and concludes: "In summing up all that has been said, we find that from the first the most general characteristic of philosophy is, that it is a *rational inquiry into ultimate principles*" (p. 45). "*Philosophy is the rational system of fundamental principles*" (p. 46). This is his last statement, which he underscores, and sets off in a line all to itself.

II. *The Relations of Philosophy.* These are three: (1), Its relation to Religion; (2), its relation to Natural Science; and (3), its relation to Empirical Psychology.

Touching the relation of philosophy to religion, our author's view is set forth in the following paragraph: "When only their striking peculiarities are viewed, philosophy and religion are as distinct as two peaks; but by going deeper, numerous points of contact are discovered. They are, in fact, two circles which intersect. Different in spirit and method, their objects are largely the same. Both consider the origin, nature, relation, and tendency of objects; but they view them in different lights, and each has a peculiar aim in their contemplation. Their intimate relation accounts for their mutual influence, and the frequent efforts to control or absorb each other. Their harmony respecting the cause and design of the universe has always been signalized by vigorous coöperation; but in disagreement their very intimacy makes the conflict between them one of life and death" (p. 57). We cite attention to the following sound position which is laid down on page 81: "In an institution established by a religious denomination, for religious purposes, it cannot be expected that instruction subversive of this end should be tolerated. No honest philosopher would accept or retain a position in which the perfect freedom necessary for a full development and free expression of his views cannot be maintained. This does not imply that a teacher must express all he imagines or believes, no matter with what consequences it may be fraught. The wise man is reserved in the utterance of mere opinions on weighty subjects—opinions which may be false and injurious, and which he himself may have occasion to change afterwards."

Concerning the relation between philosophy and natural science, Dr. Stucken-

berg says: "The more fully the relation of philosophy and natural science is considered, the deeper the conviction becomes that they require each other. Both are necessary for an intelligent consideration of the world-problem, and for all rational attempts to solve it; both are parts of the same great system of knowledge" (p. 125). Viewed as a method of knowledge, natural science seeks to systematise the phenomena and facts of nature, and also to explain the facts; but philosophy, which is in quest of ultimate causes, goes behind the facts and explanations of natural science, and inquires into the fundamental principles upon which they rest. Science, therefore, suggests problems which philosophy must answer. Of course in a world where everything is incomplete there are collisions.

Concerning the relation between philosophy and psychology, our author's view is summed up in the figurative phrase: "Psychology is the door to philosophy" (p. 157). Psychology is "the natural history of the mind." It deals with mental phenomena as science deals with natural phenomena. "Psychology thus finds its proper place between the natural sciences and philosophy, forming, as it were, the connecting link between the two. On the one hand, it is intimately connected with physiology and the whole department of biology; while on the other, it leads directly to various philosophical disciplines. Owing to its intimate relation to other subjects, psychologists have found it difficult to confine themselves to the discussion of mental phenomena and their laws. Some drop psychology too much into physiology, while others exalt it too much into the domain of philosophy" (p. 155).

III. *The Divisions of Philosophy.* Our conscious relation to reality furnishes us four principles, namely, the principle of being, the principle of thought, the principle of feeling, and the principle of ethics. (This enumeration is certainly defective in that the principle of religion is omitted.) Philosophy is a rational inquiry into fundamental principles, and so divides itself upon these four principles, and we have:

1. Metaphysics,—the philosophical inquiry into reality itself, into the very essence of being.

2. The Theory of Knowledge, or Noetics,—the philosophical inquiry into the first principles of thought, or pure intellections.

3. Æsthetics,—the philosophical inquiry into the beautiful, which is the ground-principle of all emotion.

4. Ethics,—the philosophical inquiry into the first or fundamental principles of morality.

5. Rational Religion (we would add),—the philosophical inquiry into the first principles of natural religion, or natural theology, as it is sometimes called.

These five subjects constitute, in our judgment, the scope of philosophy. Dr. Stuckenberg does not formally list the fifth, but in his discussion of the relation of philosophy and religion he reveals the fact that he would not be averse to its being added as one of the grand divisions of philosophy.

R. A. WEBB.

LE CONTE'S EVOLUTION AND ITS RELATION TO RELIGIOUS THOUGHT.

EVOLUTION AND ITS RELATION TO RELIGIOUS THOUGHT. *By Prof. Joseph Le Conte, of the University of California.* New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1888.

"We regard the law of evolution as thoroughly established. . . . The consensus of scientific and philosophical opinion is already well-nigh, if not wholly,

complete. . . . The day is passed when evolution might be regarded as a school of thought. We might as well talk of gravitationists as evolutionists," p. 257. Thus writes Prof. Le Conte on the one hand. On the other hand, Mr. Etheridge, whose connection with the British Museum has given him the largest range of observation on this subject of any living scientist, says: "In all this great museum there is not a particle of evidence of the transformation of species. Nine-tenths of the talk of evolutionists is sheer nonsense, not founded in observation, and wholly unsupported by fact;" and Prof. Virchow, one among the foremost of European scientists, in a public address at the late ter-centenary of the University of Edinburgh, declared with emphasis, "Evolution has no scientific basis."

As one reads such conflicting statements the question arises, How comes this conflict? On examining the book before us the answer at once presents itself. Prof. Le Conte, on the one side, and Mr. Etheridge and Prof. Virchow on the other, do not use the word evolution in the same sense; they are not talking about the same thing.

Prof. Le Conte defines evolution, as he uses the term, as follows: "1. The human body may be studied in a state of progressive change. Now, we perceive that the stability is never perfect, the equilibrium is ever moving. By the ever-changing number and relative power of the coöperating parts, the equilibrium is ever being disturbed, only to be readjusted on a higher plane, with still more beautiful and complex inter-relations. This is growth development, evolution. 2. We may study the solar system in its origin and progressive changes. . . . This is cosmogony; it is evolution. 3. We may study society in its onward movement. . . . This is social progress; it is evolution. 4. We may study the earth in its gradual progress towards its present condition. . . . This is physical geology; it is evolution. 5. Lastly, we may study the whole organic kingdom, . . . in its gradual progressive approach, through all geological time, toward the present condition of things, by continual changes in the parts, and therefore disturbances of equilibrium and readjustment on a higher plane with more complex inter-relations. This is development of the organic kingdom. In the popular mind it is, *par excellence*, evolution." Pp. 5-7. Charles Darwin, universally regarded as the father of evolution in its modern form, defines it, "The origin of species by descent, with modifications," and Prof. Huxley, its most eloquent advocate among scientists, defines it, "The evolution hypothesis considers that existing species are the result of pre-existing species, and these of their predecessors by agencies similar to those which at the present day produce varieties and races, and, therefore, in an altogether natural way." According to these definitions, the fifth of Prof. Le Conte's specifications, and that only, is embraced under the name evolution. Not in the popular mind alone, but in scientific controversy, when the competing claims of creation and evolution are under discussion, it is in this sense, and this only, the term evolution is and ought to be used. It is undoubtedly in this sense that Mr. Etheridge and Prof. Virchow use it in their statements quoted above.

As to Prof. Le Conte's first four particulars, viz.: growth-development, cosmogony, social progress, and the gradual process by which our earth has become what it is, there is "a consensus of scientific and philosophical opinion well-nigh, if not wholly, complete." Does Prof. Le Conte ask me, Do you accept them, in the general, as true? I answer, Yes; as true as that "the Dutch have taken Holland." But when we come to his fifth particular, and he asks me to place it in the same category with the other four, I demur. It must be admitted by all that evo-

lution, in the sense of "the origination of species by descent with modifications," especially when understood to include man—intellectual, moral, religious man—as Prof. Le Conte understands it—is not accepted by very many eminent scientists and philosophers in our day; *e. g.*, among scientists I may name Mr. Etheridge and Prof. Virchow, as appears from their statements quoted above; among philosophers, Prof. Henry Calderwood, of Edinburgh, who writes of it: I cannot regard evolution "otherwise than as a passing though prominent feature of nineteenth century thought," (*Princeton Review*, 1876); and Prof. Watts, of the Assembly's College, Belfast, who writes: "Despite the efforts of evolutionists, the laws which protect and perpetuate specific distinctions remain unrepealed, and science joins its testimony to that of revelation in condemnation of the degrading hypothesis that man is the offspring of a brute." (*Reign of Causality*, p. 317.) It is a pity that a scientific term which, I think I may say by "common consent, has come to have a definite meaning, should be used with a very different meaning in a scientific work like that under review. Such a course can lead only to misunderstandings and confusion of thought, and so prove an obstacle to progress in a true knowledge of nature. And the fact that the etymology of the word evolution, *i. e.*, an unfolding, would authorize such a use, does not justify this course, any more than the same reason would justify my confounding astrology and astronomy, or because I regard creation as an unfolding (evolution) of God's plan of bringing our world into being, my claiming that I, and not Prof. Le Conte, am the true evolutionist.

Prof. Le Conte's work bears the title of "Evolution and its Relation to Religious Thought." Lack of space forbids an examination in detail of his views on this subject. To one point only would I ask the reader's attention, and on this point I will give his views in his own words. On page 277 he writes: "It is evident that yielding here." *i. e.*, a yielding such as is implied in adopting his views of evolution, "implies not a mere shifting of line, but a change of base; not a readjustment of details only, but a *reconstruction of christian theology*" (the italics are his own). "This, I believe, is indeed necessary. There can be little doubt in the mind of the thoughtful observer that we are even now on the eve of the greatest change in traditional views that has taken place since the birth of Christianity." The general nature of this change which Prof. Le Conte anticipates, appears in his words, on pages 310, 311: "If, then, the direct influence of the Spirit of God on the spirit of man be what we call revelation, then there is evidently no other kind of revelation possible; and, furthermore, such revelation is given to all men in different degrees. It is given to all men as conscience; in greater measure to all great and good men as clearer perception of righteousness; in preëminent measure to Hebrew prophets and christian apostles; but supremely and perfectly to Jesus alone. But there is, and in the nature of things there can be, *no test of truth but reason*" (here again the italics are his own). "We must fearlessly, but honestly and reverently, try all things, even revelation, by this test. We must not regard, as so many do, the spirit of man as the passive amanuensis of the Spirit of God. Revelation to man must of necessity partake of the imperfections of the medium through which it comes. As pure water from heaven, falling upon and filtering through earth, must gather impurities in its course, differing in amount and kind according to the earth, even so the pure divine truth, filtered through man's mind, must take imperfections characteristic of the man and of the age. Such filtrate must be redistilled in the alembic of reason to separate the divine truth from the earthly impurities."

GEO. D. ARMSTRONG.

McCOSH'S RELIGIOUS ASPECT OF EVOLUTION.

THE RELIGIOUS ASPECT OF EVOLUTION. Bedell Lectures, 1887. *By James McCosh, D. D., LL. D., Litt. D., President of Princeton College.* New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1888.

"There is a theistic as well as an atheistic evolution," writes Prof. D. S. Martin. "Both recognize successive grades and stages of being, physical, organic, intellectual, moral, following one another in time-order and logical order. Both admit that the lower leads up to the higher, by various processes as yet but little understood. But the one holds that the lower possesses a self-developing power by which the higher is wrought out independently and of necessity, that the lower involves in itself 'the promise and potency' of the higher; that all the scheme of order and progress and interdependence is the result of an unconscious play of forces. The other holds that above, and beyond, and before all possible order and progress, is a supreme, conscious Intelligence, of which everything in the universe exists as a product embraced in an original plan, and that all laws and forces are but expressions of this great primal force, which works along lines of orderly and systematic development." (*Christian Thought*, Oct., 1887.) In the work before us, Dr. McCosh gives no formal definition of evolution; but it is evidently theistic evolution, as above defined, with certain modifications hereafter to be noticed, for which he contends.

1. To theistic evolution, as defined by Prof. Martin, christian writers have objected, that the God of the Bible is something more than "a supreme, conscious Intelligence." He is a God everywhere present, and everywhere active in the world which he has created, "preserving and governing all his creatures and all their actions;" immanent in nature, and accomplishing his designs with or without the intervention of second causes, as seemeth to him good. This is evidently the doctrine taught by Paul in his words: "In him we live, and move, and have our being" (Acts xvii. 28); and by our Lord, when he says: "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? And one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father. But the very hairs of your head are all numbered." (Matt. x. 29, 30.)

To obviate this objection, Dr. McCosh modifies the doctrine of theistic evolution as above defined. He writes: "Because God executes his purposes by agents, which it should be observed he has himself appointed, we are not therefore to argue that he does not continue to act, that he does not now act. He may have set agoing the evolution millions of years ago, but he did not then cease from his operation, and sit aloof and apart to see the machine moving. He is still in his works, which not only were created by him, but have no power without his indwelling. Though an event may have been ordained from all eternity, God is as much concerned in it as if he only ordained it now. God acts in his works now quite as much as he did in their original creation. The effects follow, the product is evolved, because he wills it, just as plants generate only when there is light shining on them; just as day continues only because the sun shines" (p. 59). This is a most important modification of the doctrine of theistic evolution as hitherto generally held by its advocates.

2. A second modification of that doctrine, and one not less important than the one already mentioned, is, that instead of the whole series of "successive grades and stages of being, physical, organic, intellectual and moral following one another,

the lower leading up to the higher" by a process of evolution, Dr. McCosh teaches that there has been an immediate intervention of divine power, in the form of creative agency, at a number of points along the line of progress. The points which he particularly mentions are the introduction of Light, of Life, of Sensation, of Instinct, of Intelligence, and of the Moral Sense. (Pp. 48-52.) Of these he writes: "No mundane power can produce them at first, and it is reasonable that we should refer their production to God, to whom all power belongs, even the power of evolution. As evolution by physical causes cannot do it, we infer that God does it by an immediate fiat, even as he created matter, and the forces that act in matter. We certainly know of no other power capable of doing it. This seems a legitimate conclusion. It calls in a power known otherwise to work, and to be competent to produce the effect. It makes God continue the work of creation; and if God's creation be a good work, why should he not continue it? Often it may be with seasons of cessation that the already created agents may fully develop themselves. He may be a continuous creator as he is a continuous preserver, thus widening and enlarging the sphere of his wisdom and of his love" (p. 54).

In his Preface, Dr. McCosh writes: "While I thought there was truth, I believed there was error in the common exposition of evolution, and that the work of the coming age must be to separate the truth from the error" (p. x.), and to effect this separation, and eliminate the error, is his object in writing the book under review. The doctrine of theistic evolution, as here set forth, is certainly very different from "the common exposition" of it. According to Dr. McCosh's teaching, an active deity has come to the front,—is no longer half-hidden in the dim obscurity of millions of ages ago; and has come to the front as continuously active in creation as in providence; and further, nature no longer presents an unbroken continuity of evolutions from star-dust up to man, but is broken, at seven different points at least, by acts of direct creation on the part of God. If now, he will go one step further in the application of the principle he states in his words, "a physical cause can give only what it possesses; it cannot create anything new" (p. 52), and the fact, that the production by birth of a new natural species from an older one man has never seen, furnishes the proper scientific proof that natural species possess no such power; and conceive of the evolution of which he sees proof in nature as but the unfolding (evolution, if he chooses to call it so,) of a plan of "continuous creation," according to which higher and higher forms of living beings have been brought into existence, as the constantly improving condition of the world furnished a suitable environment for them, he will, I think, have eliminated the last remaining error from "the common exposition of evolution," and find himself in possession of the old doctrine of creation; nothing more, nothing less.

The theistic evolution for which Dr. McCosh contends is theistic in the christian sense of that term, and includes the belief in the Scriptures as a divinely inspired revelation, and so of the historic truth of the first two chapters of Genesis. Passing by certain scientific objections to the doctrine of evolution as set forth by Dr. McCosh, there are two difficulties in the way of our accepting that doctrine, growing out of explicit statements of Scripture, which we wish to present for his consideration.

1. Genesis ii. 3, has always been understood to record the close of God's work of creation with the close of the sixth day. "And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God

created and made." Dr. McCosh expressly tells us that he believes the days here mentioned were ages, or eras—possibly of very long duration (p. 71). And, further, he expresses his general concurrence in the geological views of creation taught by Professors Guyot and Dana (p. 69). According to the views of these eminent scientists, the seventh day is the age, or era, in which we are now living, sanctified or hallowed by God's greater work of redemption. Moses' declaration that this seventh day is a day during which God is resting from his work of creation is emphatically confirmed by the testimony of science. In the words of the Duke of Argyll, "The evidence of geology has always been that among all the creatures which have in succession been formed to live upon this earth, and enjoy it, man is the latest formed. So far as we yet know, no new form of life has been created since the highest form was made. The cycle of creation has closed" (*Primeval Man*, p. 118). Now, according to the teaching of all evolutionists, and Dr. McCosh is no exception, if I understand aright the last chapter of his book, evolution is at work in our world to-day as of old, producing—very gradually, and by a very slow process, it may be, but yet producing—new species of plants and animals; and so God's work of creation is going on throughout this seventh day, as during the preceding six. Professor Conn's work, so largely quoted by Dr. McCosh in the book before us, bears the title of "Evolution of To-day." How does Dr. McCosh propose to harmonize this with Moses' statement in Genesis ii. 3?

2. Respecting the creation of man, Dr. McCosh writes: "If any one asks me if I believe man's body to have come from a brute, I answer, that I know not. I believe in revelation, I believe in science, but neither has revealed this to me" (p. 79). In the above extract, Dr. McCosh does not express belief in the evolution of man's body from that of a brute; but he does declare that, in his judgment, the Scriptures do not settle the question of its origin. As he is here discussing a scientific theory, it is fair to presume that he uses terms in their scientific sense. Now, man, *Homo sapiens*, is a bi-sexual species, and includes the female along with the male. Moses so uses the term man in Gen. i. 27: "So God created man in his own image; in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." How will Dr. McCosh reconcile his statement quoted above with Gen. ii. 21, 22: "And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept; and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof. And the rib which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man?"

Dr. Woodrow, who, in so far as the testimony of Scripture respecting the origin of Adam's body is concerned, agrees with Dr. McCosh, saw this difficulty, and has fairly met the issue by declaring: "In the circumstantial account of the creation of the first woman, there are what seem to me insuperable obstacles in the way of fully applying the doctrine of descent." (*Southern Presbyterian Review*, 1884, p. 356.) Prof. Drummond meets this difficulty, along with others of a similar character, in an entirely different way. "Genesis," writes he, "is a presentation of one or two great elementary truths to the childhood of the world," and illustrates what he believes to be the character of the record by quoting Geo. McDonald's "Baby's Catechism:"

"Where did you come from, baby dear?
Out of the everywhere into the here.

Where did you get your eyes so blue ?
Out of the skies as I came through.
Where did you get that little tear ?
I found it waiting when I got here.
Where did you get that pearly ear ?
God spake and it came out here.
How did they all just come to be you ?
God thought about me and so I grew.

And he adds : "For its purpose, what could be finer ? or even a more true account of the matter than this ? Without one word of literal truth in it, it would carry to the child's mind exactly the right impressiou." (*Pop. Science Monthly*, April, 1886.) How does Dr. McCosh propose to meet the difficulty ?

GEORGE D. ARMSTRONG.

IX. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

AN INTRODUCTION TO DOGMATIC THEOLOGY, Based on Luthardt. *By R. F. Weidner, S. T. D., Professor in the Augustana Theological Seminary.* Rock Island: Augustana Book Company. 1888.

In a rather poorly prepared volume, so far as its mechanical features are concerned, the author, who is a professor of theology, gives the Prolegomena to a system of divinity which he proposes to publish. From it we can learn but little of the details of the forthcoming publication, but have evidence of the ability and candor with which the author approaches his work. He is careful to show the great prominence which has been given of late to Biblical Theology, and while attributing to it all proper importance, maintains that Dogmatic Theology has yet a place, and that the difference between the two is by no means the difference between the human and the divine. The introduction summarizes the author's ideas under the four heads of the Definition, the Contents, the Method, and the History of Dogmatics.

MANUAL OF CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES. *By George Park Fisher, D. D., LL. D., Titus Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale University.* 16mo, pp. 123. 75 cts. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1888.

The book is properly called a manual. It contains, in brief compass and compact and terse style, a large number of definitions, facts and principles connected with the evidences of revealed religion, making a volume well adapted for general circulation and popular use. The principal subjects treated are the Nature of Evidence; Miracles: Their Meaning, Possibility, and the Possibility of Proving Them; Admitted Facts Respecting Christianity; The Portraiture of the Character of Jesus; Proof of the Resurrection; The Genuineness of the Gospels; Trustworthiness of the Apostles; Alleged Errors; Prophecy; Intrinsic Excellence of the Christian System; Contrast of Christianity with Other Religious and Philosophical Systems, &c. All these topics are presented with the author's characteristic learning and force. The book will prove a valuable one.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE HOLY BIBLE: An Integral and Essential Part of the Inspired Scripture of "The Wonderful Numberer," Considered in its Relation to the Kingdom on Earth of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, from its First Establishment in Eden to its Final Perfect Development in the Church Triumphant. *By a Presbyterian of the American Church.* 8vo, pp. 608. Buffalo: The Christian Literature Company.

At the expense of much labor, and with a large degree of scholarship and acquaintance with the Bible, the author seeks, by a vast array of details and a careful study of the Old Testament records, to maintain the position named in the sub-

title, viz. : that the chronology of the Bible is an essential part of the Scriptures. As is usual with interpreters of the numbers and periods mentioned in the Bible, he finds ample scope for the imagination, and he avails himself without stint of the opportunity. The combinations, coincidences, and harmonies brought out by various arrangements of dates and numbers show ingenuity, and are sometimes suggestive. The value of the work, however, will be regarded as small, a verdict to which the author's announcement of himself as "a Presbyter of the American Church" will hasten the mind.

THE HEART OF THE CREEDS. Historical Religion in the Light of Modern Thought. By *Arthur Wentworth Eaton*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1888.

If the author had added to his title the words "plucked out," he would have more fitly described his work. In the spirit of Munger, Maurice, Dean Stanley, and others, whom he sets forth as the "best thinkers" of our time, and whom he follows until he even outstrips them, if such an Irishism may be allowed, he seeks to have "enlightened common sense," but a popular name for man's inner consciousness, the interpreter of what the Bible teaches concerning God, man, Christ, the creeds, &c. As usual, the result is to dethrone God by making him only immanent and not transcendent, to elevate man as unfallen but greatly erring; to deny all that is vicarious in Christ's work; to declare the Bible characterized by "mistaken opinions, inconsistencies, contradictory statements, and inaccuracies of various sorts." The "christian consciousness" is made vastly more of than the Spirit of God, and "modern thought," in whose "light" the author would show our faith and regulate it, is subsidized by perverted disposition to reduce inspiration, divinity, sovereignty, sin, and everything spiritual and supernatural to a *minimum*. It is to be hoped that the book will find few readers, for in taking language and an unusually insidious manner it confounds revelation and reason, weakens faith, and, by persuading men to trust to the guidance of their own consciousness, sets them hopelessly adrift. Semi-panteist in his views of God, Sabellian in his judgment of the trinity, and Universalist in his ideas of the atonement, his book should be relegated to the limbus of high shelves and dust.

THE UNITY OF THE TRUTH IN CHRISTIANITY AND EVOLUTION. By *J. Mar Hark*, D. D. 12mo. pp. 293. New York: John B. Alden. 1888.

This book will be of no more use than to show the antagonism of the human heart to the things of God. It postulates the need of something to settle the perturbation manifested in the theological world, and then kindly furnishes a remedy by inviting interpreters of the Bible and teachers of dogmatics to bring themselves into harmony with the new supposed discoveries in the scientific world. Evolution is lauded as "the characteristic note of contemporary thought," and all the prevalent disturbance and uneasiness in the theological and religious world are declared to be simply the result of the recognition that it is not in accord with this "characteristic note of contemporary thought." Evidently the author's conception of the fundamental principles of sin, the fall, depravity and the necessity of regeneration is obtained out of the "inner consciousness," not out of the Bible, else he would have another and more satisfactory way of accounting for the facts which he supposes to exist as to the disquiet among believers. The uneasiness of the

theological world, its antagonism and opposition and struggles, exist more in the author's mind than in fact, which should heavily discount all his arguments. He seems to have no thought of the practical result of attempting to reconcile religion to everything that opposes it rather than reconciling the world to religion; and if he had set himself as resolutely to work to show the viciousness of dogmatism in the department of physical science, and to illustrate its vagaries and uncertainties and uneasiness and shiftings, as he does to show these supposed features in religious thought and expression, he would have done a worthy work. The indictment to be brought against the entire class represented by the author, from Drummond down to himself, is that *they strive to make all the adjustments from one side*, and in their apologies to the scientists are so abject and yielding that they bring not only their faith but themselves into contempt.

ETERNAL ATONEMENT. *By Roswell Dwight Hitchcock, D. D., LL. D., Late President and Washburn Professor of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary.* 12mo, pp. 306. \$1.50. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1888.

A few years ago Dr. Hitchcock destroyed all his written sermons except about thirty. Of these, nineteen are given us in this volume, the title of which is taken from the first one in the book. Dr. Hitchcock has left so little of his work in permanent form that this collection of his sermons will be of special value. The discourses well illustrate the vigor and breadth of his intellect, the sententiousness and suggestiveness of his style and the type of his theology. His statements will not all be received with unqualified approval, but notwithstanding few will rise from a perusal of these sermons without having felt a quickening and stimulation such as few other men could impart.

THE ETHICS OF MARRIAGE. *By H. S. Pomeroy, M. D., Boston.* With a Prefatory Note by Thomas Addis Emmet, M. D., LL. D., and an introduction by Rev. Jos. T. Duryea, D. D. With an Appendix, etc. 12mo, pp. 197. \$1.00. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1888.

While demurring to the several times repeated statement that the prevention or destruction of unborn human life is *the* American sin, and will be, if not checked, our calamity,—a statement that savors very much of the long known habit about Boston of calling everything that is New England “American,”—we must give our most cordial endorsement to this valuable work. Its author is a physician of long practice, and deals with his subject intelligently and boldly, yet in language always chaste. The object is to utter a cry of warning, and to awaken popular interest in the effort to check the sin which he portrays, and in the principle of heredity as related to the family. Dr. Duryea, in his introduction, remarks:

“There may be many who will think the author impertinent in addressing them on such matters. Let it be remembered by them that he aims to enlighten their ignorance, correct their mistakes, save them from crime, warn them of peril, and rescue them, and others through them, from physical and moral injury and suffering. They have their protection. They are not compelled to read what he has written. It is now generally conceded that one of the alienable rights of man is ‘the liberty of prophesying.’ All profound moralists affirm that it is not only the privilege but the duty of a man who knows what others do not know, to teach them; who sees the wrong they do not see, and yet commit, to correct them; who

perceives the peril they do not discern, yet rush upon, to warn them; who anticipates the ruin they do not forecast, yet surely go to meet, to save them. Woe to him if he shuns the duty! In the end the sting of a just conscience, the condemnation of just men, and the judgment of a just God will find him."

AN EXPLANATORY COMMENTARY ON ESTHER, with four appendices, consisting of the Sacred Targum, translated from the Aramaic, with notes, Mithra, the Winged Bulls of Persepolis, and Zoroaster. *By Professor Paulus Cassel, D. D., Berlin.* Translated by Rev. Aaron Bernstein, D. D. 8vo, pp. xxxv, 400. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; New York: Scribner & Welford. 1888.

The author, already well known by his commentaries on Judges and Ruth in Lange's *Bibelerk*, displays in the work before us the same acute historic sense, exegetical and critical faculty and broad scholarship shown in his previous work. He expounds the book of Esther in a most vivid and graphic manner. The stores of Jewish tradition, the histories of Herodotus, and other ancient books, the reports of travellers, the modern discoveries and researches of oriental explorers, the remains of ancient customs and manners, and the suggestions and data of philological science have all been levied upon to light up the text and the better to illustrate God's wonderful dealings with his chosen people. Another great object before the commentator's mind is to make manifest from this book the evil of the persecutions to which the Jews have been so unrighteously subjected in all ages. His discussion of the absence of the name of God from the book, of the political relations of Mordecai and Esther to Xerxes, of the vengeance of the Jews against their foes, and his fanciful interpretation of the passage concerning the "number of the beast," (Rev. xiii. 18,) which he maintains is found in Hebrew letters in the name Haman the Wicked, and which the Jewish conception of Haman as the dragon suggests, are striking and ingenious. Of the numerous and curious interpretations of "the number of the beast," the author very artlessly says that it is to be hoped that his interpretation will set them at rest.

The appendices, which introduce the reader to matter that has not been very familiar, will be found valuable to students of Jewish tradition and oriental religions.

MY SERMON NOTES. Part IV. *By C. H. Spurgeon.* From Romans to Revelation. 12mo, pp. 405. \$1.00. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1888.

With this volume, Mr. Spurgeon completes his "Notes." The series of four volumes is not intended to help men deliver a message which is not their own, but to guide and stimulate their thoughts, "to help them so to preach as to win souls for Jesus." He appeals constantly to the one who uses these Notes to clothe them with that assurance and authority which are to be found only in a deep experience of divine truth in the heart and life. The "Notes" are *Spurgeon's*; that is enough to commend them to the gospel preacher.

YALE LECTURES ON PREACHING, and Other Writings. *By Nathaniel J. Burton, D. D.* Edited by Richard E. Burton. New York: Charles L. Webster & Co.

Dr. Burton was not popularly known outside of his immediate section, for he rarely appeared abroad, confining his work largely to his city of Hartford and his own church. This volume of Lectures, Essays, Sermons and Letters, however,

fully confirms the opinion entertained of him by those who knew him best and were most capable of appreciating him, that he was one of the most perfect essayists of our times. Some of the subjects of his Lectures are these: Originality in the Preacher; Imagination in the Preacher and in Sermons; Assimilation of Sermon Material; Veracity in the Ministry; Routine, its Perils and its Values. The addresses are on Horace Bushnell, Leonard Bacon, Henry Wilson, and others. His essays are on Worship, Love of Truth, and Agnosticism. In all these he displays fine imagination and originality, and in style is decidedly unconventional and free.

THE HEATH IN THE WILDERNESS, or Sermons to the People. *By the late Rev. Richard Newton, D. D.* To which is added the story of his life and ministry, by W. W. N. 12mo, pp. lix., 374. \$1.50. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1888.

The book takes its name from the title of the first sermon of the twenty which it comprises. These sermons are all characterized by the fervor, unction and evangelical spirit for which their writer was so widely known, and will be found most useful for home and private reading. The memoir of Dr. Newton is full of interest, and tells of the career of a man whose evangelical views, holy life and successful work contributed largely not only to the growth of his church, but to the restraining of her too strong inclination towards ritualistic and "High Church" practice and belief.

DIALOGUES OF PLATO: Containing the Apology of Socrates, Crito, Phædo, Protagoras. *Translated, with Introductions, by Henry Cary, M. A., Worcester College, Oxford.* 12mo, pp. 189. London: George Bell & Sons, York street, Covent Garden; New York: Scribner & Welford. 1888.

This volume is one of Bohn's Select Library, and is a happy selection to place beside Bacon's Essays, Lessing's Laokoon, Dante's Inferno, etc., which have been already published in the same handy, cheap, but beautifully printed form. Plato's Dialogues are too well known as a classic to call for remark, but the ever-fresh interest with which the story of the trial, imprisonment and death of Socrates is invested will be quickened by the happy translation and beautiful form here given the old favorite.

THE CHILDREN FOR CHRIST. Thoughts for Christian Parents on the Consecration of the Home Life. *By Rev. Andrew Murray, author of "Abide in Christ," etc.* 12mo, pp. 448. \$1.25. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1888.

This book, prepared for both devotional and didactic purposes, gathers together God's messages of comfort and help for those who are endeavoring to rear their children for Christ. It seeks to impress upon parents' minds the fact that God's purpose of grace includes their children as well as themselves, and that his covenant is "well ordered and sure" in reference to this part of his plan.

WITH CHRIST IN THE SCHOOL OF PRAYER. Thoughts on our Training for the Ministry of Intercession. *By Rev. Andrew Murray.* Eighth Thousand. 16mo, pp. 274. \$1.00. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1888.

The author, who is deservedly one of the most popular of writers upon devotional subjects, tells us that it was under a deep impression that the place and

power of prayer in the christian life are too little understood that this book was written. He maintains that we do not fully know what prayer is when we regard it only or chiefly as a means of maintaining our own christian life; that it is the highest part of the work entrusted to us, the root and strength of all other work. The book is well designed to illustrate and enforce this idea as well as to guide the heart in its approach to Christ.

BETTER NOT: A Discussion of Certain Social Customs. *By J. H. Vincent.* 18mo, pp. 86. 50 cts. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1888.

Wine-drinking, card-playing, theatre-going, and dancing are the subjects discussed. The author speaks earnestly. He is, as usual, brief, spicy, and interesting, even in giving his warning, "Better not." The book will be read. Its motive and the spirit displayed in the treatment will win friends even among those whose hearts are in the world.

HYMNS AND THOUGHTS ON RELIGION. *By Novalis.* With a Biographical Sketch. Translated and Edited by W. Hastie, B. D. Pp. 135. Price, \$2.40. New York: Scribner & Welford. 1888.

"Novalis" was the *nom de plume* of Friedrich von Hardenberg, who was born May 2nd, 1772, at Wiedestedt, in the district of Mansfeld; and on March 25th, 1801, "he fell calmly and softly asleep under the melodious sound of the piano." Thus the gifted young man, sickly in body, passed away at the early age of twenty-nine. His parents were Moravians, and he received his religious training in accordance with their tenets. His mind, though philosophical, seems to have been shadowed by a species of mysticism. In this elegant volume before us we have first his *Hymns to Night*, which were written in that period of deep sorrow caused by the death of the young girl whom he was about to wed. They are lyrics of a veiled and strange character. We next have his *Spiritual Songs*, which are dreamy, idealistic, and sorrowful. The last section is *Thoughts on Religion*. These are very brief observations, many of them beautiful and suggestive. They are intended as theological "seed-corns."

JOHN B. FINCH. His Life and Work. *By Francis E. Finch and Frank J. Stibley.* New York: Funk & Wagnalls. Crown 8vo, nearly 600 pages. \$1.50.

A man of conscientious convictions of what is right and duty, who has the courage to express them, will always be heard. Such was the late John B. Finch, the great apostle of prohibition. He espoused the temperance cause early in life, and worked with untiring energy until suddenly cut down in the midst of the conflict. His addresses and debates are logical in argument and eloquent in style, yet expressed in great simplicity. This book of five hundred and sixty-nine pages, giving his struggles with poverty in youth, his public speeches against the rum power, and memorial tributes made by prominent men, is very interesting reading matter alike to young and old. He who observes the signs of the times must know that the prohibition movement is the forthcoming question in our national politics. This volume gives many surprising facts and figures for those who are willing to be informed.

THE HISTORY OF THE CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH. *By B. W. McDonnold, D. D., LL. D.* 8vo, pp. 644. Nashville: Board of Publication of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church.

A handsomely printed volume, and illustrated by a number of engravings of prominent ministers of the Cumberland Church. The author devotes most of his space to a showing of the work which his denomination has done and is now doing, seeking justification for the unhappy division which led to its organization in the success which God has bestowed upon his branch of the church. Its exhibit is well calculated to stir the hearts of his fellow-believers. The protracted discussion at Belfast of the true relation of the Cumberland body to the great organizations holding to the Concensus of the Reformed Churches as represented in the Presbyterian Alliance, will give special value to this book.

PRINCETONIANA: Charles and A. A. Hodge, with Class and Table Talk of Hodge the Younger. *By a Scottish Princetonian, the Rev. Charles A. Salmon, M. A., Rotheray.* With portraits, etc. Crown 8vo. \$1.25. New York: Scribner & Welford. 1888.

These personal recollections and memoranda of Princeton's great teachers will be found delightful reading. To Princeton men the book revives many happy associations, and to others illustrates the power of the men whom it describes, not in tiresome biography, but in sketches of their work, accounts of their ordinary methods and recollections of their every day talk. The Table Talk of the younger Hodge is particularly attractive, for, unlike his father, he excelled in sententiousness, pure wit and fancy, and an incisive way of putting things. The book is a vivid and life-like sketch both of the theologians and of the theology of Princeton.

THE SEMI-CENTENARY OF DAVIDSON COLLEGE. Addresses Historical and Commemorative, delivered Wednesday, June 13, 1887. Published by order of the Board of Trustees. 18mo, pp. 165. Cloth, 50 cts.; paper, 25 cts. Raleigh: E. M. Uzzell. 1888.

The commemoration of the semi-centenary of an institution which has wrought as great good for the church and state as Davidson College is eminently becoming and useful. The placing in printed form of the addresses delivered on that occasion makes the happy impression more permanent and useful. This beautifully printed little volume is well adapted to attract the eye and all who love this favored college of the church and desire her prosperity will delight to read its fair pages.

KESA AND SALJIRO; or, Lights and Shades of Life in Japan. *By Mrs. J. D. Ca-rothers.* 12mo, pp. 442. \$1.50. New York: American Tract Society. 1888.

The American Tract Society has here made a most valuable contribution to our missionary and Sabbath-school literature. The book is thrillingly interesting, both as an account of Japanese child life and of the spread of the "Jesus doctrine." It is a simple story of two young lives which, beginning far apart in locality, advantages, social standing and surroundings, were brought together by a knowledge of the true faith. It is a pure, wholesome, instructive, stimulating book, well worthy of a place in every house where there are children to be kept pure in mind and heart. Its cover and illustrations add greatly to its attractiveness.

A MAN'S WILL. A Novel. *By Edgar Fawcett.* 12mo, pp. 308. \$1.50. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1888.

A powerfully written temperance story, full of striking yet unfortunately true and natural scenes. The author depicts intemperance as it prevails in the higher walks of life, deals with the matter of drink as encouraged by social customs, and portrays its frightful effects. There is no plot, but the reader's interest is held continuously by the strength and vigor as well as skill which the writer has so happily succeeded in putting into his work.

THE LAND OF THE PUEBLOS. *By Susan E. Wallace.* 12mo, cloth, finely illustrated. Price, 75 cents; post. 10 cents. New York: John B. Alden. 1888.

Mrs. Wallace, who is the wife of Gen. Lew Wallace, author of "Ben Hur," is well known as one of the brightest, most entertaining and instructive writers of the day. This volume will greatly enhance her reputation. It is a delightful thing to visit with her the picturesque, romantic, always curious, and sometimes wonderful, scenes which she places before the reader almost as vividly as the reality. The story of an ancient American civilization—if not as old as that of Egypt, yet even more deeply shrouded in mystery—is a fascinating one, and ought to be familiar as may be to all American readers. Thousands will welcome the book with real delight, and no reader who takes it up will fail to be entertained and instructed.

HOME ATLAS OF THE WORLD. 11x14 inches; pp. 112. Cloth, \$2.00. New York: John B. Alden, Publisher. 1888.

A World's Atlas, on a large scale, and yet cheap enough to be in the homes of those in most moderate circumstances, has long been a *desideratum*. It is furnished in the above publication. The maps are not only very complete, but are brought up to the latest development of the various countries of the world in railroads, adjustment of territorial lines and discovery. The completeness of the work and its remarkably low price commend it to popular use.

ALDEN'S MANIFOLD CYCLOPÆDIA OF KNOWLEDGE AND LANGUAGE. With Illustrations. Vol. V.—Bile to Brave. Vol. VI.—Bravo to Calville. New York: John B. Alden. 1888. Cloth, 40 cents; half morocco, 55 cents per volume.

The fifth and sixth volumes of this combined dictionary and encyclopædia sustain the reputation of the previous issues. Their literary and mechanical features are admirable, and one cannot refrain from wondering how so handsome and complete a work can be published at such a low price. To those who are unable to possess the costly works, this will be found almost as useful. As the volumes increase in number, one sees the beauty of the external features of the work and the comprehensiveness and scope of the contents.

Date Due

[illegible]

Library Bureau Cat. no. 1137

X Per P928A v.2 230311

Presbyterian Quarterly

X Per P928A v.2 230311

